

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 40--80th Congress

Chapter 43--1st Session

H. R. 2102

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 40	1
Index and Summary of History on H. R. 2102	.2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 40

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM. Authorizes extension of the program through December 31, 1947, and requires that it be liquidated within 30 days thereafter. Authorizes the continued use of all labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program by amending Sec. 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 to read "or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier" in lieu of "or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier." Provides that this legislation shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service. Provides that the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture take action to assure cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor. Authorizes, with provisions, the retention of any Mexican farm laborer presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment to remain in this country as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, but not later than December 31, 1947.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 2102

January 27, 1947	H. R. 1388 was introduced by Rep. Hope and referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced. (Similar bill).
February 4, 1947	Hearings: House, H. R. 1388, and H. R. 2102.
February 20, 1947	H. R. 2102 was introduced by Rep. Hope and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. Print of the bill as introduced.
February 24, 1947	The House Committee reported H. R. 2102 without amendments. House Report 70. Print of the bill as reported.
February 26, 1947	S. 724 was introduced by Senator Capper and was referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the bill as introduced. (Similar bill).
March 3, 1947	House Rules Committee reported H. Res. 124 for the consideration of the bill. House Report 82. Print of the Resolution.
March 4, 1947	H. R. 2102 debated in the House and passed without amendment. Remarks of Rep. Johnson.
March 5, 1947	H. R. 2102 referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Print of the bill as referred.
March 7, 1947	Hearings: Senate, H. R. 2102 and S. 724.
March 12, 1947	Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported H. R. 2102 with an amendment. Senate Report 52. Print of the bill as reported.
March 19, 1947	Amendment proposed by Senator Capper. Print of the amendment.
April 7, 1947	Amendment proposed by Senator Knowland. Print of the amendment.
April 8, 1947	H. R. 2102 debated in the Senate and passed with amendments. Senate Conferees appointed.
April 10, 1947	House disagreed to Senate amendments. House Conferees appointed.

April 15, 1947	House received the Conference Report. House Report 270.
April 22, 1947	Both Houses agreed to the Conference Report.
April 28, 1947	Approved. Public Law 40.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 1388

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 27, 1947

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1948.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant
4 to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Pub-
5 lic Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, title I), as amended
6 and supplemented, shall be continued up to and including
7 June 30, 1948. In order to continue to make available
8 for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers,
9 labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore avail-
10 able in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home
11 Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-

1 ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by
2 deleting therefrom the following language: "or until six
3 months after the termination of the present hostilities as
4 determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or
5 by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting
6 in lieu thereof the following language: "or June 30, 1948,
7 whichever is the earlier". Such amounts as may be neces-
8 sary for the continuance of such program as provided in
9 this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

A BILL

To provide for continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1948.

By Mr. Hope

JANUARY 27, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

HEARINGS

BEFORE

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 1388

TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUANCE OF THE FARM
LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM UP TO AND
INCLUDING JUNE 30, 1948

(H. R. 2102, TO PROVIDE FOR A SIX-MONTH EX-
TENSION AND FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE
FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM, AND
FOR OTHER PURPOSES, REPORTED)

FEBRUARY 4, 5, AND 6, 1947

Printed for the use of the Committee on Agriculture



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1947

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

CLIFFORD R. HOPE, Kansas, *Chairman*

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Minnesota
ANTON J. JOHNSON, Illinois
REID F. MURRAY, Wisconsin
CLIFF CLEVINGER, Ohio
GEORGE W. GILLIE, Indiana
EDWIN A. HALL, New York
WILLIAM S. HILL, Colorado
CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Iowa
SID SIMPSON, Illinois
CHESTER H. GROSS, Pennsylvania
HADWEN C. FULLER, New York
ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, California
PAUL B. DAGUE, Pennsylvania
ABE MCGREGOR GOFF, Idaho
NORRIS COTTON, New Hampshire
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Hawaii

JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR., Virginia
HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina
ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Missouri
STEPHEN PACE, Georgia
W. R. POAGE, Texas
GEORGE M. GRANT, Alabama
WALTER K. GRANGER, Utah
E. C. GATHINGS, Arkansas
JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina
EUGENE WORLEY, Texas
THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi

E. L. BARTLETT, Alaska
A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Puerto Rico

GEORGE L. REED, JR., *Clerk*

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page.
Buie, Wilson R., Director, Labor Branch, Production-Marketing Division, Department of Agriculture.....	43
Christgau, Victor, director, division of employment and security, State of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minn.....	94
Ferris, Josiah, Jr., vice president, United States Sugar Corp., Clewis- ton, Fla.....	81
Ogg, W. R., Washington representative of American Farm Bureau Federation.....	1
Rector, Stanley, chief counsel, industrial commission, State of Wis- consin, Madison, Wis.....	84
Towson, A. L., president, Kent Labor Association, Maryland.....	76
Wilson, George, director, California Farm Bureau of the American Farm Bureau Federation.....	34
Statements from organizations and individuals.....	25-34, 63-67, 96-105

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee on Agriculture met in the committee room, New House Office Building, at 10 p. m., Hon. Clifford R. Hope (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We have met this morning to consider the bill H. R. 1388, to provide for a continuation of the farm labor supply program for an additional year, from June 30, 1947.

We have quite a list of witnesses, and I am going to call on Mr. Ogg, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, to appear first. I would like Mr. Ogg, if he would, to give us a brief history of the legislation which we are attempting to extend at this time. Some of the new members of the committee are not familiar with what has gone before and I would appreciate it, Mr. Ogg, if you would include that in your statement.

STATEMENT OF W. R. OGG, DIRECTOR OF WASHINGTON OFFICE, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. Ogg. Mr. Chairman, my name is W. R. Ogg, and I am director of the Washington office, American Farm Bureau Federation, with offices in the Munsey Building.

I think our organization is well known to you, so that I do not need to take any time describing that.

In line with your request, Mr. Chairman, this farm labor program was started early in the war in order to assist farmers in meeting the very large expansion in the food production goals that we were asked to meet to win the war.

Early in the war there were approximately more than 5,000,000 people who left the farms to go in war industries and go in the armed services. That movement got under way before we got into the war ourselves, as you know, due to the expansion of the production for defense, even before we got into the war; and there had been a very large industrial expansion for war purposes and there was a very large exodus from the farms into the war industries. And, of course, when we got into the war, that was very greatly accentuated, and the farms were virtually drained of their labor and it was a very critical situation that jeopardized our food supply.

So in the beginning a program was started under the auspices of the Farm Security Administration. It bogged down completely. It was a mess; it was not getting results, and so the farmers came to Congress and asked them to straighten out the mess. We went to the Appropriations Committee. It was a very critical situation. The farmers were desperate and could not get any labor. After going into the matter very thoroughly, the Appropriations Committee—I might say at that time it was a rather controversial issue, and I don't mind saying that the Department presented a program that the farmers thought was unworkable. The Department asked for \$65,000,000 and we believed the matter could be operated for about half.

To make a long story short, the Appropriations Committee recommended and Congress approved a program which would provide for, I think at that time, \$36,000,000. The larger part of that went for the recruitment of farm workers and the transportation of those workers, and also interstate workers; but the major part was turned over to the State extension services on a decentralized grant-in-aid basis; and I think on the whole the program has been administered very economically, particularly the part handled through the State extension services. They placed, I think, approximately 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 workers a year. It really was a lifesaver. That program, I believe, was inaugurated about 1942 or 1943, as I recall it.

It has been continued year after year since that time by action of the Appropriations Committee, the authorization being carried in the appropriations bill, until last year this committee passed a continuing resolution for 6 months to carry this program from December 31. It was due to expire December 31 last, and during the last session of Congress, in order to make it possible to give a little more time to developing a permanent program, this committee reported out a resolution effecting the continuation of the entire program for 6 months, which would take it up to December 30, 1947.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are faced with this practical situation. I think, as far as I know, the farm organizations are all agreed—the other organizations will speak for themselves—but, speaking for the farm bodies, we have gone into this matter very fully.

At our last annual meeting, held in San Francisco, December 10-12, 1946, it was the considered judgment of our leaders that we would need a permanent, continuing farm labor program; not on the scale we had in the wartime, to be sure. We don't think the need will be anywhere as great. In many areas the need will be very limited. In other areas, where there is a large amount of seasonal labor, the needs, of course, will be much greater; but there will be, in the judgment of our people, a continuing need for assistance to farmers in getting the labor they need when they need it, particularly in the case of these perishable commodities where they use large amounts of seasonal labor.

Now we believe fundamentally that program should be decentralized as soon as possible, and we believe that a number of improvements can be made in the present program that will reduce the cost of administration and will improve the effectiveness of it. We have been working on the other farm organizations on that matter, trying to develop our recommendations to submit to you for a permanent program.

Now we run into a number of problems. There is the question of the disposition of these farm labor camps and the mechanics of operating the program, and a lot of other difficulties that have made it impossible for us to get in just a short time a program that we would recommend and be willing to back.

We believe that we can get it in the reasonably near future, and we believe—I think there is substantial unanimity on the major objectives of that program, but there are some of those details that we would like a little more time to consider in making our recommendations to you for your consideration.

Now in the meantime we are up against a practical situation. The authority and funds for this entire program will expire on June 30, next.

Our Government, we understand, is to go to Mexico very soon to negotiate for the recruitment of farm workers for this year. Unless this present authority is continued beyond June 30 of this year, they can only recruit workers up to the period of June 30, and those workers must be returned to the country of origin not later than June 30.

Now practically that means that the farmers do not know what to count on. They can count on those workers to plant their crops, but unless they can be assured that they are going to have the labor to harvest the crops, they do not want to take the risk of planting their crops and maybe not have the labor to harvest them.

So we come to you gentlemen today, rather reluctantly, I am frank to say, to ask you to authorize the continuation of this program temporarily until a permanent program can be secured. I want to reiterate, we strongly favor enactment of legislation for a permanent program just as soon as it can be possibly done. We believe that is a sound and proper thing to do, but we are up against this practical situation, the canning processes. There are canners now making their contracts for acreage for 1947, and the farmers and the canners have got to know what they can count on in the way of labor; not only in the way of planting the crops, but to harvest, and the negotiations are going on right now. So that I think, Mr. Chairman, about summarizes why we are coming to you to ask you if you won't approve this bill for a temporary continuation.

Speaking for the Farm Bureau, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we would prefer that such a continuation be made for a 6-month period. We don't believe you can predict at this time whether or not we are going to need foreign workers in 1948. We may need them. On the other hand we may not, and it seems to us the December 31 date is probably the best cut-off date, and it would be our judgment if you provided a 6-month continuation, that would afford time during this session of Congress to consider and, we believe, to enact, a permanent program.

Furthermore, I think this needs to be considered: If you continue recruitment of foreign workers into the first 6 months of 1947, it would probably be necessary to continue it through the calendar year 1947, because of the same situation we are up against now.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you a question, Mr. Ogg.

If we make the termination date December 31, 1947, should there not be some provision for liquidating the program after that time?

Mr. Ogg. Yes, I am glad you mentioned that. That is very important. In other words, they should have authority, I believe, to

recruit through 1947, with a provision for liquidation of the foreign worker's program after December 31. That would mean some of those workers could be kept beyond December 31, and returned after December 31, but you would not recruit any more workers after December 31.

Now I want to say this: If the committee, after going into the matter fully, feels that there is too much risk—you may not get a permanent program this session, and there is risk in not having any program more than 6 months of 1948—therefore, it would be practical then to authorize a 12-month continuance so that the next Congress could deal with this problem. We would not oppose it but we would recommend that if you decide that 12 months' continuance is the proper thing to do, that you insert in that, with respect to foreign workers, authority to recruit without question throughout 1947, with liquidation after that date; but that after December 31, no new foreign workers be recruited unless the Secretary of Agriculture determines that an adequate supply of domestic workers cannot be secured.

In other words, the effect of that would be to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make a fresh study and determination as to the real need, and if there is need he would then have authority to go ahead, but only on the basis of the determined need.

Now I believe, Mr. Chairman, that is my statement. If there are any questions, I will be glad to answer them. We have several gentlemen here from different areas of the country who can give you, better than I, first-hand information and tell you about the needs of the farmers for this program, and particularly with respect to the need for farm workers at this time.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Ogg, I understand that several hundred thousand displaced persons have come into the United States during the last few years from the war areas. Would there be any objection to recruiting workers from that group?

Mr. OGG. No, sir; I do not see any objection at all.

Mr. ANDRESEN. And they are already in the country.

Mr. OGG. I do not see why they should not be used.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Do you think they would be willing to work—go out and work—in these areas where there is need for farm workers?

Mr. OGG. I do not know what the laws and regulations are governing that, but if it is possible to do so, as they are here, and if they are willing to work, I do not see why they should not have the opportunity. Certainly they should be able to work the same as foreign workers that we bring in.

Mr. ANDRESEN. And it would be less expensive.

Mr. OGG. I think so. The farmers' whole purpose, Congressman Andresen, has been, throughout this whole program—and they have taken the position consistently—that they do not want to see a single farm worker recruited and brought over here who is not needed. But if they cannot get workers here who are willing to work on the farms, why then the farmers are up against it. A farmer either has to have the workers or go out of business, and in that case we think the farmers are justified in asking for this recruitment of such farm workers as are needed; but we do not want any more than are needed. Certainly we want to give our own people in this country the first opportunity.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Ogg, don't you think now that we have considerable surplus labor as the result of our soldiers coming back and retrenchment in industry, agriculture might get all the additional workers they need from those groups, so that we would not need this foreign labor? Certainly we could move them locally like we did before.

Mr. OGG. Well, the trouble is, Congressman, our people are not going back to the farms. I have here some figures on that which the Department of Agriculture published in the bulletin, Farm Labor Bureau Journal, Agricultural Economics, issued by the Bureau of Farm Economics, January 13, 1947. It is rather interesting. It is as follows:

Placements of World War II veterans on farms November 1946, New England had a total of 44; Middle Atlantic States, 193, for all that large area—that is, for hired hands, tenants, and share croppers combined.

Now that area, the Middle Atlantic, is an area where there is a large need for seasonal labor.

Well, in the Midwest, a little larger: The East North Central, there were 771; West North Central, 493; and South Atlantic, 356, and so on. The total for the whole United States was 7,800, which, of course, is a drop in the bucket compared to the 10,000,000 who are at work on the farms.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I can readily agree as to the reason why they do not want to work on the farms.

Mr. OGG. I am not saying that to criticize the veterans. I would not want that to be so considered, but the farmer has to have labor and those are the facts.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Well, there is really no inducement for the young man to go back on the farm when he gets the wages that they now receive in industry and elsewhere, and when you take into consideration the hours they will have to put in.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; the wages are higher in most cases.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Ogg, when we continued this program the last time, I thought it was generally understood that one of the main objects was to give us time to make a determination as to whether or not the program was to be made permanent. Is that right?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, why should we not face that fact now? Why should we have a further continuation of the present program?

Mr. OGG. I agree with you that we should face it now, and we tried very sincerely, you know. I have been working day and night, as far as my little contribution goes, but we have had a lot of meetings of representatives not only of farm organizations but of other groups that are in agriculture that are interested in it, trying to work out a program that we felt would do the job as far as the needs of the farmer are concerned.

As I indicated earlier, though, we ran into some practical problems that we have not worked out, at least to our satisfaction, but we are up against the practical situation, Congressman, that we have got to know right away—the Government has—what to do in the way of recruitment of workers in Mexico, for example. We have got to know whether to recruit them for 6 months or 12 months, and the farmers on the other hand are up against it particularly now in the canning areas. The canners are contracting now for acreage and the farmers

have got to know whether they will have labor to harvest as well as plant their crops.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I received a letter from the assistant attorney general of the State of Virginia in regard to the Virginia Unemployment Compensation Commission. He has been counsel of that commission for almost 10 years, and he wrote me in regard to this legislation under date of December 31, and I would like to know how to answer his letter. I know you are familiar with that whole program and probably you can give me some help in formulating an answer to this letter. Maybe I had better read it [reading]:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Richmond, January 31, 1947.

HON. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: I understand that hearings on H. R. 1388 will be had before the House Agriculture Committee on February 4.

As you know, I have been counsel for the Virginia Unemployment Compensation Commission for almost 10 years, and, as such, I have naturally become familiar with all its workings and especially its functions in connection with the administration of the employment service which was recently returned to the States after having been operated by the Federal Government from January 1, 1942, to November 15, 1946.

Insofar as H. R. 1388 provides for continuation of the domestic farm placement program in the Agricultural Extension Service, I feel that this would be rendering a disservice to the farmers of Virginia. Although the estimated expenditure in Virginia by the Agriculture Department in connection with this service during the calendar year 1945 was \$113,767, nevertheless, it is a fact that the agricultural placement program in Virginia has not been of any appreciable service to the farmers in their efforts to obtain farm labor. There has been allocated to the State of Virginia for the calendar year 1946, \$150,000 in continuation of this useless service. One of the most frequent complaints that the Unemployment Compensation Commission of Virginia hears from all sides is the utter failure of the farmers to obtain any real assistance in this connection.

Since the Employment Service has been returned to the States, naturally employers of every class look to the State employment service for assistance in recruiting personnel and when they do not get any assistance or satisfactory assistance, they blame it on the State employment service.

The State employment service has a network of local offices scattered throughout the State of Virginia, which offices are already organized and staffed and ready immediately to perform this function at a saving of a good many thousands of dollars. It might be that in some sections additional employees would have to be obtained to render this service efficiently, but it can certainly be done through the State employment service more satisfactorily and for a small percent of the money now being wasted by the Agricultural Department in the Extension Service.

I hope that it will be your pleasure to look into this matter and resist any efforts to continue the present farm-placement function in the Department of Agriculture.

With best regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

KENNETH C. PETTY,
Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. OGG. Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I would have right here today the information on the situation to answer very specifically with respect to conditions in Virginia, but I will be glad to put something in the record on it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not think that is the point of major concern, but it seems to me that he is putting his finger on the problem in regard to the State unemployment situation when he says that he thinks that the work can be done through the State employment

service more satisfactorily and for a small percent of the money now being wasted by the Agriculture Department in its Extension Service.

Mr. OGG. I would not agree with you, Mr. Flannagan, that there is a duplication, for this reason: I will say we had an Employment Service when this program was started but it was not doing the job. It completely fell down on the job. There was universal complaint all over the United States about the way the Employment Service was handling the placement of farm workers. For the most part they had people who knew little or nothing about the farmers and the farmers' problems or the handling of farm labor.

I am speaking now of prewar periods and the early part of the program. The thing that led to this program: They were not doing the job and all too often they were under the thumb of labor unions and were using that as a means of recruiting membership in labor unions and forcing unionization of workers, and all that kind of stuff.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The State employment offices were doing that?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; and under the guidance and promotion of the Federal.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Was that ever eliminated when you set up the Federal organization?

Mr. OGG. No, it was even worse when it was federalized, because they were promoting it all the more, and I will say we supported very drastically returning the employment services to the States. That is favored by the farmers and they so think, and that subject has been discussed very fully among the farm people all over the country, and I think you will find that to be their views with very few exceptions. There are exceptions where they are not too dissatisfied, but by and large the farmers are unalterably opposed to turning this job over to an agency that is largely an industrial labor agency.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, now, would you ask them to turn it over to the States?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If that is true, why not let the States run it?

Mr. OGG. That is true. The big part of this job, outside of the recruitment of the foreign workers and coordinating the movement of interstate domestic workers, the big job that is done in this program is really done through the State extension services. They have placed something like over 4,000,000 workers in a year, and at a very small cost of about \$7,000,000 a year. It has been very economically handled and I think you will find farmers everywhere agree that they have done a magnificent job. I know I have heard it afield. They say it has been a lifesaver. They have done it at a very low cost. They got it out of Washington; they got that part of the program out in the States and they had their own set-up with an office in every county, and all they had to do was add a few employees to provide this additional service. In many cases there were just part-time people they would hire during the peak season, and it was because they had that organization and were close to the farmers and they knew the farmers' problems, knew the conditions, knew the needs, that they were able to do this job at approximately half what the Department of Agriculture asked when they submitted a budget over here when this thing first started. The Department of Agriculture submitted a budget for \$35,000,000, but that was based on largely a Federal operation. Now by getting it largely decentralized and

handling it through the State extension services, to a large extent the cost was cut half in two, and it is a great deal less now.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ogg, I wonder if you will agree with this observation: Irrespective as to what action might be taken as to the permanent program, isn't it true that it would be very difficult to turn this recruitment service and placement service from one agency to another in the middle of the crop year? As it is now, the program will continue until the 1st of July.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If at that time the program should be turned over to the State services, wouldn't that disrupt the services very much?

Mr. OGG. Yes, it would be disastrous, because they do not have the personnel in those State employment services that know how to handle it; they haven't their contacts with the farmers and any new agency taking hold of this would have to hire additional personnel. It would just take months at least to really get going.

The CHAIRMAN. If a new agency took it over, shouldn't it be done at the beginning of the crop year rather than in the middle of the crop year?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; and I want to say again, gentlemen, we have come here—I have come here, I will say frankly—very reluctantly, to ask for this temporary continuance. We had hoped sincerely we could work it out and you gentlemen could work out for us a permanent program early enough in this session that we would not have to ask for a temporary continuance, but we have done our best and as far as we have been concerned, we haven't been able to do it and we are right up against the gun.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Ogg, how many States are recruiting agricultural workers?

Mr. OGG. Well, of course, the Department of Agriculture actually does the recruiting of the farm workers. I could not say offhand how many States, but I believe, to answer in a general way—I think there is a representative of the Department in the room, and he could tell you more exactly; but as I understand it the main needs for farm workers are in the Pacific coast and the mountain areas, Texas, Louisiana, Florida, and along the Atlantic seaboard up to New England, in the main. There are some in the Midwest, to a limited extent; but the heavier needs are, I think, in this area. However, I think the representative of the Department could give you that more exactly. That is all.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to Congressman Flannagan further, I would just have to disagree with the statement made in regard to Virginia. My impression is that the Extension Service has done a very fine job, and with your permission I would like to get a report on that and give you what has been done in Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Put it in the record at this point.

(The data to be submitted are as follows:)

The following statement was prepared at my request by the Extension Service in order to give the facts concerning the handling of the farm labor program by the Extension Service in Virginia. I regret very much that it was not possible for the committee to hear representatives of the Extension Service give a full report of its activities in handling the farm labor program. I sincerely hope that the committee will not be prejudiced by the unfair attacks which have been made on the Extension Service by some of the State employment services. The record will show that the Extension Service has done a magnificent job in handling the

farm labor program and farmers throughout the Nation are extremely grateful for the wonderful service which they have received. I sincerely hope that when a permanent program is considered, that full opportunity is given to the Extension Service to give the committee complete information as to the operations of this program.

RESULTS OF THE VIRGINIA EXTENSION FARM LABOR PROGRAM IN 1945

The production of crops in Virginia approached record-breaking proportions in 1945, with the exception of the peach and apple crops which were exceedingly light on account of freezes at blooming time. All crops were harvested with a minimum of loss. This was possible due to the assistance given to farmers through the extension farm labor program in recruiting local labor, supplementing the supply of local labor with outside workers and aiding in planning and organizing farm operations in order that maximum utilization of available manpower and machinery might be secured. During the 1945 calendar year \$113,767 of emergency farm labor funds were expended by the State extension service in the conduct of the program. Reports show that during the year over 18,000 orders for workers were placed by farmers with the 97 recruitment and placement offices operated. In filling these requests for labor over 94,000 placements were made in supplying workers to an estimated 7,000 different farmers. However, the effectiveness of the program in preventing loss of crops was accomplished principally by the extensive field work with farmers, workers, and communities.

The Extension Service worked closely with farmers and farm groups in determination of need for outside labor. Certifications of need were prepared and submitted to the Labor Branch, PMA, which resulted in a total of 2,589 foreign workers being made available for use during the year. The placement of these workers with employers, housing, and efficient use were also a part of the program.

The Extension Service also worked closely with the War Department in securing the use of 3,473 prisoners of war, their placement, housing, and efficient utilization. These two sources of outside labor contributed greatly to the 1945 farm labor force.

In addition to recruitment and placement activities, over 11,000 farms were assisted in obtaining more efficient utilization of labor through meetings, farm visits, and personal contacts. One hundred and fifty-four communities had an organized program for exchanging labor and/or equipment. In order that inexperienced workers might be properly instructed organized instruction was given to 1,039 labor foremen and supervisors of youth in the training and use of such labor. Lack of adequate housing continued to be a bottleneck in the distribution and efficient use of labor. Eight farm labor camps received support from extension farm labor funds, providing housing for 957 workers. Approximately \$19,000 was expended for activities incident to the housing and transportation of workers.

The results of the 1945 program were obtained through the full cooperation of farm people and State and local agencies. Over 1,300 local leaders assisted with the program in 36 different counties. Over 300 representatives of public agencies and over 400 farm men and women served on county farm labor advisory committees. These committees were assisted by 25 subcommittees, such as camp committees, victory farm volunteer committees, etc. Existing growers' associations were used in addition to two nonprofit farm labor associations which were organized during the year. Full use was made of newspapers, radio stations, and general meetings to acquaint the public with the labor situation and for stimulating the recruitment of local workers.

The Virginia Extension Service worked closely with other Atlantic Coast States from Florida to New York in a program designed to promote the orderly movement and full use of some 20,000 migratory workers. This included the operation of a migrant information station at Little Creek for a period of 3 months to disseminate information regarding work opportunities in the Atlantic Coast States. By providing reliable information regarding work opportunities this source of labor was largely responsible for the saving of crops in the Eastern Shore and Norfolk areas.

As a result of this program practically no crop loss occurred, principally because farmers used the labor more efficiently and, through full cooperation of existing agencies, placement offices were able to direct workers to locations where they were most needed and could be used to the best advantage.

In 1946 increased emphasis was placed on helping farmers secure needed labor through their own efforts. Since the fighting phase of the war was over, employers were encouraged to assume many of the responsibilities performed prior to

the war. Practices leading to increased efficiency and better employer-employee relationships were recommended with increased emphasis. Information programs designed to acquaint workers regarding areas of need and employers with sources of supply were strengthened and expanded. The effectiveness of such a program is well demonstrated in securing an adequate supply of labor to harvest the record-breaking 1946 apple crop. Early in the season it was estimated that it would be necessary to use Government funds to transport at least 1,500 interstate domestic workers for this job. Information materials showing areas of need, date of harvest, conditions of employment, etc., were prepared and widely distributed. As a result local workers and workers from nearby areas responded in such numbers as to reduce the number of interstate transported workers to less than 20 percent of the number originally anticipated. Formal recruitment and placement was reduced to a minimum. As a result the cost of the 1946 program is estimated to be \$60,000, considerably less than the cost of the program during the war years.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do they understand you are against turning these unemployment services over to the various States?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; very strongly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Why?

Mr. OGG. There are several reasons. First, because we know by past experience they cannot do the job, they have not done the job in a way satisfactory to the farmer. There is a great deal of complaint and dissatisfaction.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Wait a minute. Are you referring to the United States Unemployment Service?

Mr. OGG. I am talking about the one handled by the States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Did we have a set-up in the States before the United States engaged in that enterprise?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What States had it?

Mr. OGG. A lot of States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Name a few.

Mr. OGG. I think California.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. California? All right.

Mr. OGG. Well, I think a number of the States had it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. All right; go ahead and name a few.

Mr. OGG. I could not name them all.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Before we got in it?

Mr. OGG. Before the Federal Government federalized it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is right.

Mr. OGG. Yes, I believe every State had some sort of a service. I think that is correct. I can check it, but my understanding is that all had some kind of a State agency.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Ogg, did you advocate turning that back to the States?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; very strongly.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. But now you want this agency set up in this Department to do the job?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; because we do not want to see industrial agencies handling farm labor, because they do not know the farmer problems; they do not know the agricultural conditions; they do not have the intimate contacts with the farmers and farm workers; and therefore they are not able to place the workers in the best manner or to meet the farmers' needs.

Secondly, another very fundamental reason, Congressman; you know farmers and I cannot give you my opinion. Another funda-

mental reason is that too often union labor dominates too much the policies and procedures of that organization.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What organization? The State?

Mr. OGG. These employment services, both Federal and State.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Well, it is worse in the Federal Government than it has ever been in the States.

Mr. OGG. Yes, I agree with that 100 percent.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then that objection goes out the window and I will certainly say you have improved it by turning it back to the States.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Now I received a telegram from my State saying they are in a position to do a better job than the Department can ever do, that they can take care of the situation, and they strongly oppose the continuation of this. Do you think those boys out there know or do not know what they are talking about?

Mr. OGG. I will not put it that way, but from past records, you go out and talk to the farmers and ask them what they think about it. I think you will find universally, with few exceptions, the farmers were dissatisfied with the manner in which it was handled before the war and they wanted something done about it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Was that by the Federal Government?

Mr. OGG. No, that was the States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Was that the way the Federal Government handled the program, on coming down into my cotton country where we need farm labor and recruiting farm labor, paying their way out to Arizona to pick cotton for a few weeks and then paying their way back and sending them to California or some where else where they could proceed to get a divorce from their wife. Those were the programs the Department of Agriculture was engaged in and that was the custom. Do you want that to continue?

Mr. OGG. You are getting into another question. I think our record is clear on that issue. We went to Congress when this program was first started and we said we certainly did not want this program centralized in Washington, but we wanted it decentralized; we want no agency handling it and we asked the whole program be turned over to the Extension Service, decentralized at the State level. But what was done? Many of you remember. There was quite a controversy over it. As a compromise they set up two agencies in the Department, the Office of Labor which handles farm labor and interstate recruitment of domestic workers, and the rest of it was turned over to the State extension service.

I believe a lot of that trouble could have been avoided if you had had it all handled through the Extension Service and had it decentralized, rather than trying to run it from Washington.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I don't believe you could have the Extension Service handle the whole operation. Would you load them down with everything?

Mr. OGG. No, it should be decentralized and put in the States to a large degree so that at the Federal level all you would have would be largely a coordination of assistance to the States, but the job would be done in the States and counties.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. From what countries do you get this farm labor?

Mr. OGG. Most of them come from Mexico. There are a few come from Canada, some from the Bahamas, I believe, and there may be one or two other sources, but those are the main sources.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is quite an expense to move and feed and look after the Bahamans.

Mr. OGG. It is a very small expense to move them over into Florida, Congressman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If you want to solve this problem, why don't you let the States solve it? Why not ask California and places like that that need them to go ahead and do it? Let them go down there and make contracts with the Mexican Government to bring them up and handle their own job and leave the Federal Government and the Extension Service out of it. Why not let the States do it?

Mr. OGG. When we come before you with permanent legislation, that is what we are going to ask for.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Why get in all this controversy?

Mr. OGG. When we come to the permanent program, Congressman, I think you should go into all of that, but all we are asking today is, give us time to work that out by continuing this long enough so that we can go into all those problems. We would like to go into some of those problems.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You want the Federal Government out?

Mr. OGG. If you are going to have coordination of these efforts, there must be some assistance.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thought you wanted it all thrown back to the States. You are sure you have not been advocating that?

Mr. OGG. Congressman, as far as recruiting and replacement of labor is concerned, I believe, I think our organization's record is clear and consistent from the very first program we advocated. We said it should be handled in the States with the orderly coordination of the efforts at the Federal level, and we asked that in the original bill, which I will be glad to put in the record. The American Farm Bureau recommended what you said, that the State of California should recruit or could go to Mexico and get their own workers, as well as the Federal Government.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. If you have recommended it, why fool with this thing any further?

Mr. OGG. Because it is a major problem.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thought you wanted to get it down in the States.

Mr. OGG. We do, and in the permanent program that we are going to recommend that will be done.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. All you need to do is pass a resolution giving these States authority to go down and hire these foreigners if they can get them. That is all you need.

Mr. OGG. Let me illustrate: Along the Atlantic seaboard you have a problem of getting seasonal labor at different times, from one State to another. Now while the recruitment and placement can be done at the local level, somebody has got to give information. For instance, each month information is needed in regard to workers' requirements or workers available. It may be they cannot get enough workers in Maryland and so it is necessary to have a clearing house at the national level so that they can send that information out to the States where they think there may be labor and they can recruit them and assist them in getting those workers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Could not the State of Maryland do that job?

Mr. OGG. I don't think they could do a good job. I do think you need a coordination of information at the national level.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And you want that done there?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; I am speaking only for the Farm Bureau Federation. I cannot speak for any other groups.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Fuller would like to ask a question.

Mr. FULLER. I would like to ask how many foreign workers are in this country under this program.

Mr. OGG. On January 1, according to this report of the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Economics, Farm Labor Bulletin, of January 13: On January 1 there were about 25,000, as I recall. I will give you the exact figure.

On January 1, 1947, according to this report, there was a total of 25,013 foreign workers employed in agriculture.

Mr. ABERNETHY. How many?

Mr. OGG. 25,013.

Mr. FULLER. I believe you made a statement concerning 4,000,000 workers being handled at a cost of \$7,000,000. Is that right?

Mr. OGG. No, that is only the number. There were a lot more employed during the past year. That is only the number on January 1.

Mr. FULLER. But did you state they placed 4,000,000 workers at a cost of \$7,000,000 to process or handle those? Did you make that statement?

Mr. OGG. That is recruiting and placement. I believe I said they recruited and placed something over 4,000,000 workers in 1947.

Mr. FULLER. At a cost of \$7,000,000. Is that right?

Mr. OGG. Approximately \$7,500,000 was appropriated. I do not know whether that much was spent or not. I assume practically that much.

Mr. FULLER. Now in regard to that I would like to ask a question as to what personnel handled the placement of that 4,000,000 workers.

Mr. OGG. Well, Congressman, I do not have that. There are in the room, I believe, representatives of the Department of Agriculture who could give you the exact figures, if you would not mind. I could get it for you but I don't have it and they do have it.

Mr. FULLER. What I wonder is this: One of the questions we are faced with is the cutting down of Government personnel.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; and we are for that.

Mr. FULLER. And an amusing thing happened up in our section. I am from northern New York State.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. FULLER. And we have the feeling that the local representative group could handle the situation better than any other. We thought it should be handled at the local level as to the actual placement. What is your feeling in regard to this recruitment of labor?

Mr. OGG. We have had the position that the job of recruiting should be done at the local level. The only need at the Federal level is some assistance in coordinating data on available help and coordinating the obtaining of labor and the movement of workers from one job to another, but the job itself must be done at the grass roots.

Mr. FULLER. And do you really believe that you can import into my congressional district men on the Federal pay roll that can handle our labor situation better than local men?

Mr. OGG. No, sir; we have opposed it.

Mr. FULLER. You have opposed it?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; that is why I said earlier we favored decentralization of the program entirely and putting the whole job of recruitment and placement in the hands of the Extension Service because it is decentralized. That is a grant-in-aid program handled at the State level and county level and you get it out of Washington. I don't mind saying we think it is centralized too much now; but in the permanent bill, if we have one, I hope they will completely decentralize it. I agree with you on that.

Mr. FULLER. Could you give us the average weekly wage of the so-called farm help that is imported in this country?

Mr. OGG. Well, the regulations require that they be paid the prevailing wage in the community, whatever that is. I have here the wage rates in the United States, if you would like to have them.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Ogg, do you mean that the recruiting service placed 4,000,000 workers on farms?

Mr. OGG. How is that?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Did I understand you to say that the recruiting service placed 4,000,000 workers on the farm?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; and I have this report showing it by States as of November 1946, for the United States. It shows a total of placements here of 4,006,083 from January to November.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Evidently then they placed the same man many times.

Mr. OGG. That does not mean that many individuals, but constitutes the number of placements and one man might be placed more than once.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If you shuffle them around, that would increase the number.

Mr. OGG. Yes.

Mr. FULLER. That is less than \$2 per head.

Mr. OGG. Yes. Of course, while it may be the same man, there is the job of contacting and making that placement. That placement is about the same, whether it is a new man or one formerly employed.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Did I understand you to say that this service has only cost the United States Government \$7,000,000?

Mr. OGG. No; I had reference to the State figures. I will be glad to put in here the main cost; the larger cost, of course, is the cost of transporting foreign workers and domestic workers. The cost of transportation is a big item.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. What was the total cost?

Mr. OGG. The 1946? I got these figures over the phone this morning so they are subject to verification from the Department, but I was informed this morning that in 1946 the cost of the farm labor program was \$18,000,000 for the year 1946. The cost of handling the State extension part of the program was \$7,500,000, and the Federal Government paid \$1,430,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is not all the money we put into the farm employment replacement program?

Mr. OGG. This is the cost of the farm labor program that we are talking about here. It is the farm labor, both domestic and foreign.

\$18,000,000 is the total cost of the farm labor, and approximately \$27,000,000 over-all cost for the total program.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How many placements of farm labor did you make in 1946?

Mr. OGG. For 1946 the total for 11 months, or 10 months, I am not sure of that—Mr. Pace has it—either for 10 months or 11 months, there were a little over 4,000,000 workers placed.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How many of those were foreign workers?

Mr. OGG. I do not have that figure; I am sorry.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You don't have that figure of those brought in?

Mr. OGG. I am sorry. There is someone from the Department here who can give that.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is anyone from the Department who can furnish those figures for the record, we would like to have them.

Mr. E. J. OVERBY. I am E. J. Oberby, of the Secretary's office, Department of Agriculture. We brought in about 51,000 workers in 1946, and it cost \$18,000,000; and we had 80,000 in the country.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You imported 81,000?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And you spent \$18,000,000 on foreign labor? Is that right?

Mr. OVERBY. Substantially. I say we spent about \$17,000,000 on the foreign labor program.

Mr. FULLER. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if I understand the witness correctly, now we have 51,000 foreign laborers brought in by this Government at a cost of \$18,000,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. To get them in and get them back. We had to transport them back.

Mr. OGG. I understand there was quite a carry-over from about 30,000, which made really about 81,000 that were here.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Pace, you are next.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Ogg, within a short time, possibly within 2 years, in my judgment, you will be before this committee in connection with legislation to do something about certain people on the farms of this country. I am sure you realize that the farms of this country are being mechanized just as rapidly as the labor unions will permit them to be and we can buy the farm machinery. Within a period of 5 or 10 years there will be between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 surplus people on the farms of this Nation, for the very simple reason that they will not be needed.

Members of this committee had an opportunity during the fall to visit different sections of the country and saw many mechanized farms in operation. I had an opportunity to visit the High Plains of Texas, where one man cultivates 200 acres of cotton, where I rode for 4 long days and I did not see a mule and I did not see a horse. You look across the plains and you can see a dust cloud, and when you get close you see 3, 5, or 10 tractors drawing 8-, 10-, or 12-row cultivators. Now that is going on all over the country. The population on the farms during the war went down to 25,000,000 and it is probably up to 26,000,000 now. I think one of the most serious problems facing the Nation is going to be the surplus people on the farms of the Nation because of this mechanization, which will further aggravate the concentration of our population in the extremities.

It strikes me as strange that you should be here now, long after the termination of hostilities, trying to bring in more foreign people to work on the farms when we now have, including the unemployment of veterans, thousands of unemployed among our civilian population, in the total running into millions of people who are without employment; and with this serious problem facing us, what are we going to do with the surplus people on the farms of this Nation in the near future? I don't understand why we should be called upon to give our time in bringing in more foreign workmen.

I can understand why the farmers like it because the Federal Government goes and gets the foreign workers in Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, and other places and brings them in, puts them down at the farmer's door, provides a place for them to live, provides medical attention, doctors' expenses, burial if they should die, supports the members of their family, and provides them food; and when the crop is harvested takes them somewhere else. I think every farmer would like to have that service, but my information is that it is enjoyed by only a handful of what we call the big operators. Now is that true or not?

Mr. OGG. No, I don't think that is true, Mr. Chairman; but I don't think there is any disagreement among us on this proposition, as I stated earlier, that we do not want to ask for the importation of a single foreign worker if the farmer can get those workers in this country; but the things you are talking about may well come about, but the fact remains that in certain sections of the country the farmers are faced here in 1947 with a job—he was asked by the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the food production goals. You are familiar with them. They are almost equal to the peak of wartime levels on many crops.

Mr. PACE. Here is a survey that was made nearly 2 years after the war. Here is the survey that bares conditions that existed in 1942 and 1944, when the farms of this Nation had been stripped of their labor for other purposes.

Mr. OGG. May I explain that the farmer is up against the situation that he cannot get enough labor in certain areas; it is not universal all over the country; it is a Federal operation, but there still are important areas where they cannot get the labor to plant and harvest their crops. That is the only question. We know about unemployment insurance and of people will not work and draw their unemployment insurance, the farmer cannot change it. If they won't work, the farmer cannot make them work. The farmer has still a problem of planting and harvesting his crops. If he cannot get domestic workers, surely he should not be prevented from having foreign workers to grow and harvest his crops.

Personally I don't believe there is any possibility of using the amount of foreign workers that we have heretofore. I think the record speaks for itself. The report I gave to Congressman Pace shows that only 25,000 foreign workers were employed on January 1. Now at one time we had—in October 1945—the peak number of foreign workers was 85,000. In October 1945, the peak of war prisoners was 131,000, and that is over 200,000 foreign workers. It is now down to 25,000 foreign workers, which shows we are sharply tapering off. I don't think we will have any next year; I hope we will.

not have to use any next year, but we are talking about the classical situation.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't this the real difficulty? This labor that we are talking about is hand labor which is used on the farm for picking beans and peas and other back-breaking work which Americans will not do?

Mr. OGG. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is what the farmers are up against.

Mr. OGG. That is right; they can work shorter hours and get more money.

The CHAIRMAN. I am calling attention to what the facts are.

Mr. OGG. I certainly do not want anybody to get the impression we are asking Congress to appropriate a dollar to bring in a single worker that we do not need. If you can assure us now we will get those workers to work that may be here and not working—but the farmers cannot make them work.

Mr. PACE. What assurance have you that you will not be able to get them?

Mr. OGG. As far as we are concerned, we have checked with various leaders in the States, and that is what they tell us themselves. The farmers themselves will tell you that, and we have witnesses here who could give you that information.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Down in my district we have the case of a colored man who made \$50 picking cotton. Now I say that if you pay an adequate price for a commodity, you can get it. If you paid better wages on the farms you could get your labor to work there.

Mr. OGG. I agree with you; but, Congressman, I come back to the fact that we are coming to you gentlemen today for the sole reason that we are up against it. We know this is a temporary situation here which we do not know how to meet. The farmers need this extra labor for planting and harvesting their crops. There is little prospect that they can get it from domestic labor. They are right up against it, Congressman; they are short of labor in these areas and they do not know where they can get it, and they would like to get it; and I don't believe this program would cost this year anything like in the past.

Mr. PACE. But in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri that the farmer should receive a price for his product so that he could pay labor on a competitive basis with industry; you agree with that?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. And when that is done, that cost of labor must be reflected in the price they receive for that commodity?

Mr. OGG. Their price necessarily has got to reflect their cost plus a reasonable profit on a long plan.

Mr. PACE. I take it the Farm Bureau representative recognizes the need for including the price of farm labor in the cost of the product.

Mr. OGG. Mr. Congressman, we agree with you in principle; but, frankly, I might say there is a little disagreement in our own organization how to achieve the plan.

Mr. PACE. And, as I see it, it is the fundamental problem on the farms of this Nation; or, rather, there are three; One is to maintain a price sufficient where the farmer can receive adequate farm labor, as he is competing with other labor demands.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; he should receive a price that will enable him to employ the labor he needs, paying a decent wage, and return him a reasonable profit.

Mr. PACE. The next problem we have in the immediate future is to find adequate employment for the people on the farms.

Mr. OGG. Yes. May I just interject there the problem you raise? Of course, this may not be pertinent to this bill. This is a very temporary bill, but in the long-time problem I think that is a matter the committee should consider in considering whether or not to have a long-time labor program, the same as if we had an agency out there that understood these problems. That would be very helpful in relieving the situation. They might develop surpluses of labor in one area and shortages in another area.

Mr. PACE. The third problem the farmers have is some means of disposing of the surplus products.

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; they have.

Mr. PACE. Now, Mr. Ogg, the reason certain farmers like this program here is that it requires of them no effort whatsoever. The Federal Government goes out and solicits the labor in foreign lands, it transports them to their farms, provides accommodations for them, and when their work is over it takes them away; and, therefore, you get a very strong urge from that particular group and nowhere else.

Mr. OGG. As far as the permanent program is concerned, we favor putting in the law provisions no foreign workers can be recruited unless it is determined on the basis of factual surveys of competent agencies in the States that they cannot get an adequate supply of workers who are willing and able to work.

Mr. PACE. But you brought up no evidence that they are going to be needed this spring.

Mr. OGG. We have a gentleman in the room who will give it to you first-hand. I have checked with a number of our own people and they tell us they will have a need for additional labor. May I just say one further thing, Congressman Zimmerman? I do not want to leave any misimpression with respect to your earlier question in respect to the permanent labor program. I want to clarify our position:

While we believe this job can be handled at the least cost, and probably most efficiently, by the State extension services, if the State legislature wants to designate some other agency that certainly would be agreeable to us. I think the States should determine that work.

Mr. Gross. Mr. Ogg, you talk about a permanent program. Who is asking for a permanent program?

Mr. OGG. Well, our organization at its last annual meeting, held in San Francisco December 10-12, 1946, adopted a resolution favoring the establishment of a permanent farm-labor program. We had delegates elected by the farmers representing 100 farm groups in 45 States and they passed the resolution which I have inserted in the record in my prepared statement that I sent out.

Mr. Gross. Did those delegates who voted in favor of establishing this permanent farm-labor program represent their groups or were they voting on the little delegate body that was assembled there?

Mr. OGG. Well we had 12,000 people in the convention from 45 States. They were elected by the farmers of the country.

Mr. Gross. And do you think that problem of a permanent farm-labor program was discussed before them?

Mr. OGG. Yes, sir; this permanent farm-labor program was discussed all over the United States. We had this program, Congressman, which was discussed all over the country, and it was not anything new. It is a real problem, I admit. I won't say that the need will vary a great deal. The need is certainly tapering off, compared to wartimes, and the type of need or service that will be needed in the postwar period will be different in many respects from what we have had during the war.

Mr. GROSS. Then you have in mind we will never be able to handle our farm labor ourselves any more and we will have to bring in Puerto Ricans, Bahamans, and others?

Mr. OGG. No, sir; you misunderstood me. I am not advocating the importation of foreign workers.

Mr. GROSS. Now in regard to this talk about labor unions dominating farm labor: Is the Federal Government opposed to labor unions? Is your group opposed to labor unions?

Mr. OGG. No, we are not opposed to organized labor, but we are opposed to organized labor going out and trying to run the farmers.

Mr. GROSS. When you are bringing them in from Puerto Rico or the Bahamas or any other place, are they protected from labor racketeers?

Mr. OGG. Well I could not really answer that accurately. Some of the other men could.

Mr. GROSS. Why are you trying to break up labor unions in this country? Why are you picking on labor unions by bringing in foreign workers who do not come under the jurisdiction of the unions?

Mr. OGG. I don't believe in bringing in foreign labor, as long as we have domestic labor to do the work. I think that this foreign-labor program is very limited, if it is limited to the extent that we think it ought to be, and that is they ought not bring a single one in unless we cannot get a man to work that is needed on the farm. It is not going to hurt labor unions because they will not take the job. If we could get a labor union man to work at a prevailing wage we don't want to see foreigners brought in. I certainly don't want to, or anyone else, if we could get a domestic worker to do that job at the prevailing wage.

Mr. GROSS. I had a friend who went to Puerto Rico on business and he could not get a plane back because all the air transportation had been purchased in advance weeks and weeks before so that even a businessman could not get a plane to come back and he had to come back by boat. Now isn't that a deplorable situation, when the Federal Government pays that bill and then takes them back again?

Mr. OGG. I am not familiar with that case but I will say we cannot defend everything that has been done, and I think that there are many things can be done in the program to improve it.

Mr. GROSS. That is the way those things work out. You talk of decentralization. I will tell you how it works in one office concerning which I have knowledge. We have an office in a little country town, a decentralized office. The superintendent in this little office comes from the State of Washington; the supervising officer comes from Connecticut; the secretary comes from Maryland; and then they have an auditor from Kansas and there is a girl from somewhere else. Now they tried to let out the local lady who works in that office, for I don't know what reason. Well the lady they wanted to let out knows all about the business and she can operate the office alone, and

yet that is a decentralized office. Now the supervisor, who comes from the State of Washington, is 28 years old. He opens the office, goes across the street, and plays cards all day. That is a decentralized office, and it is wrong from every angle.

Mr. OGG. I will say, if there are any useless employees, we favor cutting them off.

Mr. GROSS. I wrote the higher office that they either keep that lady on or close the office since we do not need it. They kept her on.

Mr. OGG. I think when the Appropriations Committee goes into this they should carefully scrutinize the expenditures in the Government, whether there is any extravagance or any unnecessary employees, or any unnecessary expenses, and cut it off and limit the program to the actual, justifiable needs, to meet the legitimate needs, and we back them up.

Mr. GROSS. I know of cases where a man and wife earned \$30 a day picking potatoes, and \$17 to \$18 a day picking cherries. Don't you believe we will never get anywhere until we push the Federal Government back into Washington where it belongs and close the Federal offices which are scattered all over the country? Don't you believe we will have to do that?

Mr. OGG. I agree with you in principle. I do not know the exact case but I agree, and I think the records of the Appropriations Committee will prove we consistently advocated economies. We had some hard fights and took punishment to get economy, and I think I can pledge our organization because I know that has been our consistent position, for when this matter comes before the Appropriations Committee we will insist it be limited to justified needs. We don't want unnecessary expenses, official or otherwise.

Mr. GROSS. You fellows try to justify all these things that I have mentioned. You are asking now for a permanent, continuing agency to handle it.

Mr. OGG. Well, when I say a "permanent," I am not saying, spend just as you did before, not by a long shot. I think it should be handled for a fraction of what it cost in wartime.

Mr. HALL. I have been quite interested in your remarks, Mr. Ogg, about the seasonal migration labor situation. In that connection I am dealing with a local problem. Two of the three counties I represent hire perhaps several hundred Negroes from the Indies and Puerto Rico, Bahamas, and various places down there. They transport them to the mainland and up into our counties. About a year ago some of the good ladies, some of them wives of Colgate University professors, because of their civic-mindedness and because of their concern about conditions under which these people were living, called me up to the university and we had a conference at some length. They originally intended to sound out how I felt about foreign relations, but it developed into a conference about migrant workers and the conditions they were facing. It seems they were housed in shacks, and so on. I do not know whether that was a rule or whether it was because of the summer months, but these good ladies were very much concerned about that and the conditions that the workers were called upon to face. The point I am getting around is the \$18,000,000 that you cited. Would any of that be used to any extent, outside of the transportation, to better the welfare of some of these workers in some of the States?

Mr. OGG. Well, as I understand it, it was to provide farm-labor camps and shelter facilities where they had proper sanitary requirements and supervision; and where they are unable to get medical care, that it has been provided.

Mr. HALL. Well, I do not believe that the local people were to blame.

Mr. OGG. Frankly, I have had the feeling that they have overdone it. To be frank about it, in some areas maybe the Government paid too much. I am surprised to hear it because they have very good labor laws in New York.

Mr. HALL. Of course, I did not happen to see anything first-hand. The conference came about as the result of the interest of these women. I know the local farm situation has been handled very well by the people who hire these workers who pick peas and beans and do seasonal work, but I just wondered if there is any aid forthcoming or assistance from the Federal Government that they were getting out of that \$18,000,000.

Mr. OGG. Yes; there is authority in the law in connection with these camps to provide medical attention if it is not available otherwise, and provide proper sanitary conditions.

Mr. HALL. In some of these local situations operators might not necessarily be to blame?

Mr. OGG. No; I am not familiar with that case. If you will give me the place later, I will be glad to look into it.

Mr. HALL. I simply cited this situation that developed in my district. It may have existed in other sections, I don't know, but these people were greatly concerned.

Mr. OGG. I don't recall any complaint anywhere. In fact, on the whole I think it has been very well handled.

Mr. HALL. I think that practice has been carried on for a good many years and they know pretty well what the requirements are in bringing those people in. To my knowledge there has not been a great conflict between the local people and the Federal Government.

Mr. OGG. I might say, Mr. Hall, we urged for the last year or two that these camps be gotten out of the Federal Government and disposed of to either local or State agencies, or associations of growers, and they have gone a long way in that respect. The growers have set up cooperatives and have taken over those facilities themselves and we are strongly in favor of that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I just want to say that I, too, received a message from the executive director of the unemployment commission in my State—Mississippi—and the thoughts which have been developed cover the points I had in mind; therefore, I simply want to request that I be permitted to file this message for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. And I suggest it appear at the conclusion of Mr. Ogg's statement.

If there are other members who wish to insert telegrams from the State unemployment directors in the record, I suggest they be put in at the conclusion of the hearing, following Mr. Ogg's statement.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As a general principle of our American way of living, do you believe this is a good thing? Do you think it is well for our economy for people to have that attitude of life that it is undignified to work on a farm?

Mr. OGG. No, sir; I do not feel that way.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It seems to me the leaders of agriculture, instead of degrading the farmer and farm labor, instead of having him characterized as some old elod with one gallus over a shoulder and a two-tined fork on his baek, should do something to dignify farm labor so that people would go out and work at agrieulture in competition with other forms of labor, but so long as we evade the question it will be difficult to get any of our boys to go on the farm.

It certainly is wrong to pieture the farmer working 18 hours a day just to make a bare living, and as long as we do that we are not dignifying the farmer or farm labor. It has now gotten to the point where our boys will not go to work on the farms.

We might just as well spend more of our time in making these things desirable so that people will seek that kind of employment. Certainly it is not on a par with eoal mining and many other jobs that we have in our industries.

Mr. OGG. You touched on something that I personally feel very deeply about. I think I have always resented the implication that farming is inferior to any other ooeupations. I think it is far superior to many ooeupations and I certainly don't want anything I said here today to leave such thoughts in your mind.

All I want to say is that the farmer has to make a living and he must have labor to plant and harvest his erops, and until he can get that labor he is up against a practieal situation. That is a practieal problem. That is what I meant to imply.

I agree with your philosophy 100 pereent but as a practieal question, Where is the farmer going to be able to get the labor he needs to producee and harvest his crops? That is our eoneern here today.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Well, I saw some of this foreign labor, and I have no disposition to critieize any people. I have great admiration for the people I have seen—Navajos, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexieans, in a situation like that: They were a lot of young fellows.

Mr. OGG. Of course, during the war, as you know, the farmers had to use anything they eould get. Women and ehildren had to work in the field.

Mr. CLEVINGER. But this is 2 years after the war.

Mr. OGG. Yes, but the facts are he eould not do any better. That, it seems to me, Congressman, illustrates what the farmer is up against. He does not want to use ineffieient labor; he would like to have more effieient labor if he eould get it.

Mr. CLEVINGER. As Mr. Pace aptly said a while ago the farmers did not have anything to do with bringing them in. That is true, but they eertainly spent a lot of time bringing in farm labor, as everyone was running about. I am surprised they cannot baek their argument.

Mr. OGG. Well, of eourse, they would like to have effieient domestic labor if they ean get it. I cannot speak for these others, Mr. Chairman, and if you will pardon me, I will let them eome on, and they ean testify. [Laughter.] I think I have taken too much time. I would rather you hear these men who eome here from the States, who ean tell you first-hand.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Andresen was speaking about this type of displaeed persons. I have in my distriet in Ohio an Ameriean-born farmer whose wife was also born in this country.

The wife, by a previous marriage, has a daughter in Poland. I have been trying to have this child brought to this country to join her mother and stepfather. But I got a letter from the American consul at Warsaw that they were so busy they could not arrange for her to come to the United States, and yet, at the same time, every single relief ship we are sending over there they are dispensing with the paper work or performing it on shipboard, bringing many of these displaced people to this country, and I wonder if the Farm Bureau Federation knows of just a single worker who has come over here who would help us on the farms. It seems to me I know none. If you go into a city, you find them crowded together, increasing crowded housing conditions, whereas they could be very well placed on farms. Many beets are grown in Poland and do you know of a single beet grower coming out of all these refugees.

Mr. OGG. Well, you opened up something concerning which I really do not know.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You know they have some of the best beet growers in the world, but they do not have any concern for that type of work when they come over here.

Mr. HILL. I would like to emphasize Mr. Clevenger's idea. When I was home during the holidays three or four Russian families came into my store and wanted to know whether there was any way in the world to bring their brothers, sisters, or relatives over here. They were in that terrible country where everything had been destroyed, with no food, and when I tried to prepare a way so that these families could be reunited not one of them would help. I could not get any help at all from any of those families to bring their own families and relatives over to this country. That is the way the Russians are.

Mr. OGG. I think it should be looked into.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further questions, we thank you very much.

(Mr. OGG's statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF W. R. OGG, DIRECTOR OF WASHINGTON OFFICE, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, CONCERNING H. R. 1388 TO PROVIDE FOR TEMPORARY CONTINUANCE OF FARM LABOR PROGRAM

At the recent annual meeting of the American Farm Bureau Federation, held in San Francisco, December 10-12, 1946, one of the major problems which was given careful consideration was the farm labor situation. Voting delegates, representing the membership in 45 States and Puerto Rico, adopted the following resolution favoring the establishment of a permanent farm labor program:

"The recruitment and placement of farm workers is chiefly the problem of the farmer-employer. During the war extensive governmental financial assistance was needed in order to assure an adequate supply of farm labor for the production and harvesting of the tremendous food and fiber requirements of the world. Steps now should be taken to minimize governmental control of farm labor and limit the operations of such program to the recruitment and placement of workers and their families and the gathering and dissemination of statistical information on labor supplies.

"We recommend that at the Federal level the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture continue to administer the farm labor program as now authorized, with authority to continue the operation of the present Federal farm labor supply centers and camps with an understanding that arrangements be made for the lease or sale of such centers or camps to growers, grower groups, or State or local agencies as soon as practicable. No part of Federal funds appropriated for carrying out the farm labor program shall be used for establishing wage rates, working conditions, hours of work, housing standards, collective bargaining, or union membership.

"We will oppose any effort to transfer the administration of this program from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Labor or to any other Federal agency.

"At the State level we recommend that the present program be continued, with appropriate Federal legislation authorizing the State extension service if it does not desire to continue to conduct the operations of the program that some other State agency be created or approved by the respective State legislatures to supervise the recruitment and placement of farm workers.

"Authority should be granted for the importation, transportation, and placement of foreign workers in the event there is a shortage of domestic farm labor or a type not otherwise available."

We are collaborating with other farm organizations and other interested groups in the development of legislation to provide a permanent farm labor program along these lines. Obviously, it is going to require some time to work out such a program and secure enactment of the necessary legislation. Meanwhile, it has become imperative to secure early action by Congress to authorize the recruitment of foreign workers for the remainder of the calendar year 1947. The authority for such recruitment under existing law expires on June 30, 1947. Reports from various sections of the country that are now dependent upon foreign workers to produce and harvest their crops indicate the necessity for continuing this program through this calendar year. Farmers cannot risk planting their crops unless they can have assurance that they will have labor to harvest them in the fall. Unless the present law is continued beyond June 30, no additional foreign workers can be recruited after June 30, and all of the workers who are recruited prior to that time must be returned to countries of origin by that date.

Therefore, we urge that Congress approve a temporary continuance of the present farm labor program. H. R. 1388 provides for 1-year continuance, which would give authority to continue this program, including the recruitment and placement of foreign workers until June 30, 1948.

We believe the committee should give careful consideration to whether to continue the present program 6 months or 12 months. We strongly urge that Congress enact legislation to provide a permanent farm labor program before the end of this session. If so, there would be no necessity to continue the present law for more than 6 months.

With respect to the use of foreign workers, it has been our consistent policy to ask for the recruitment of foreign workers only when domestic workers cannot be obtained, and only to the extent necessary to meet shortages which cannot be filled by domestic workers. We do not wish to ask for the importation of a single foreign worker who is not needed, or for a longer period of time than the workers are needed, but whenever an adequate supply of domestic workers cannot be obtained, then obviously it is necessary to recruit foreign workers. We are thoroughly convinced from reports we have had from different parts of the country that it will be necessary to depend upon foreign workers in certain areas through the calendar year 1947. It is difficult at this time to determine definitely whether or not foreign workers will be needed during the first 6 months of 1948. There has already been a large reduction in the use of foreign workers in the United States as compared with wartime levels. It may not be necessary to recruit foreign workers under the program next year.

We do not believe it would be advisable at this time to make a definite commitment as to whether foreign worker will be recruited in 1948. We favor discontinuing this program just as soon as adequate domestic workers can be obtained. We believe that any permanent legislation, however, should contain the necessary authority to undertake the recruitment and placement of foreign workers at times when it is impossible to secure an adequate supply of domestic agricultural workers. However, we believe that authority should be given in the permanent legislation to undertake the recruitment and placement of foreign workers only if and when the Secretary of Agriculture, on the basis of data and information obtained through the Extension Service and other appropriate agencies in the respective States that an adequate supply of domestic agricultural workers, able and willing work, is not available. Such a program, however, would not be a permanent continuing program, but it would be geared in and out as conditions warrant.

If the committee decides to provide for a continuation of the entire existing farm labor program for a 12-month period, as provided in H. R. 1388, we recommend that the bill be amended to continue the present authority for the recruitment and placement of foreign workers through December 31, 1947, with a provision for liquidation of this program after that date, and providing further that after

December 31, 1947, additional foreign workers may be recruited only when the Secretary of Agriculture determines, on the basis of studies and data obtained by the Agricultural Extension Service in the respective States, that an adequate supply of domestic workers, able and willing to work, is not available. This would assure full authority to recruit and place foreign workers through the calendar year 1947, but after that date, the program would be liquidated unless the Secretary finds that the supply of domestic agricultural workers is adequate.

Meanwhile, we hope that Congress will enact a satisfactory permanent farm labor program. We offer our full cooperation in this undertaking.

(The following statement was submitted on behalf of the National Grange:)

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington 6, D. C., February 13, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD HOPE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOPE: We had hoped to have an opportunity to appear before the House Committee on Agriculture in support of H. R. 1388, a bill for temporary extension of the farm-labor supply program.

We realize that because of limited time, it was impossible to make an oral presentation. Therefore, this letter is to advise the committee that the National Grange heartily supports enactment of H. R. 1388.

The National Grange, by resolutions at national sessions, has approved continuation of the emergency farm-labor recruitment and placement program and especially urged retention of administration in the United States Department of Agriculture.

While we believe it may be necessary to continue the domestic phases of the program for some time, we are hopeful that Federal importation of foreign workers can be discontinued after the current crop season. We therefore respectfully suggest that the extension of present legislation be to December 31, 1948, with three additional months for orderly liquidation of the foreign-labor program.

We feel that early passage of the extension bill is essential in order that farmers requiring additional labor may have assurances of that labor in time to make crop-planting plans accordingly.

Sincerely yours,

FRED BAILEY, *Legislative Consultant.*

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. RIGGLE IN BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE ON FEBRUARY 18, 1947, RE H. R. 1388, A BILL TO EXTEND THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

We urge that the program for the recruitment and transportation of domestic and imported labor be extended for 1 year as provided in H. R. 1388.

At the annual meeting of the delegates of member cooperatives of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, a resolution was unanimously adopted with recommendations for a permanent national migratory farm labor program administered by a single branch of the Department of Agriculture.

Since the harvesting season for some 1946 winter crops is not yet complete, and the planting and preparation season for 1947 crops is at hand, it is necessary that authority and appropriations for continuing the present farm labor program for another crop year be completed as early as possible. The present authority expires June 30, 1947, in the middle of the farm-work year.

A permanent farm labor supply bill should be introduced as soon as possible. If such a bill can be considered before this session of the Congress is adjourned, its provisions will succeed on its expiration the provisions of this act which it is now proposed to extend.

The background of the labor situation on farms in the United States is briefly as follows:

1. During the war period, approximately 5,000,000 of the effective working manpower left the farms. These went into war industries and the armed services. They are not returning to rural areas as hired farm workers. Based on previous history, war accelerates the movement of people to industrial and urban areas, and only extreme depression reverses the net movement.

2. The domestic farm-labor supply remaining on the farms was supplemented in 1946 by 4,000,000 boys and girls and others recruited from urban areas under the farm labor program; by elderly farm men and women recalled from relative inactivity; and by an increase in the hours worked which reached a maximum average per day in seasonal farm operations of almost 13 hours for family workers.

3. In addition to the domestic farm labor, on January 1, 1947, approximately 25,000 workers imported from nearby countries and islands of the Western Hemisphere were still employed on our farms.

4. With the postwar let-down, domestic workers recruited in urban areas have steadily withdrawn from farm work. There has also been reported a decided relaxation of effort and reduction of man-days worked on the part of many temporary workers.

5. During the war, the well-established channels of migrant farm labor, and the areas from which they originated, were tapped, and workers normally employed on farms were drawn into industry by public and private employment agencies. Likewise the established recruitment of farm labor by private contractors and employers was discontinued in the face of war industry competition and public employment agency activities. There is little prospect that these previous channels of farm labor supply will be restored in the immediate future, and efficiency in utilization and employment can only be obtained through the joint organized efforts of farm employers and farm workers, coordinated under a public program.

6. While some displaced industrial workers are returning to areas from which they originated, workers who originally come from rural areas, now largely are classified as skilled industrial workers, and many of them utilize their savings and unemployment benefits, until suitable industrial jobs for workers of their skills are available.

7. Except those who are returning as farm owner-operators or farm renter-operators, only 34,000 veterans accepted farm work as hired workers through the farm labor program during the first 11 months of 1946. Many of those veterans who might be expected to return to rural areas have become skilled technicians through training in the armed services and upon discharge evince a preference for industrial employment. Others will accept farm jobs only on mechanized operations.

8. After the World War I, it was well toward the third year after hostilities ceased before the tight farm-labor situation was eased by industrial employment decline.

9. Farm wages are high and in many critical farm-labor shortage areas, are on a level or above comparable industrial wages. In many nonindustrial areas farm wages are well above minimum going wage rates, and in many other areas farm wages approximate or exceed minimum wage rates now under consideration by the Congress. The farm-wage rates are highest around industrial areas came recently from rural areas, the wage rates paid for farm work are not usually the deterring factor in obtaining farm help in areas having displaced war workers.

There is a heavy turn-over and movement in seasonal farm labor throughout all seasons of the year, and continuous recruiting, placement, and movement of farm workers is necessary to keep them fully employed.

11. Most public and private employment agencies are trained and preoccupied in the recruitment of urban workers, and the activities of those agencies have tended to draw labor away from rural areas.

Under future conditions, except those conditions of long continued mass unemployment in industry and services, the continuation of a farm labor service devoted to assisting farmers and farm workers in meeting employment needs will be important in maintaining employment on farms at a high level. A very large proportion of all farm labor must be skilled in picking and packing, dairy operations, operating farm machinery, handling livestock, or in other specialized operations.

It is anticipated that there will be adjustment in production in some commodities due to changing domestic and export needs. However, the total volume of farm production on the basis of the present outlook will remain large, particularly of those products which require manual work with a high degree of specialization, such as has been provided under this law.

Based on the information available to us from official and private sources, we respectfully urge that provisions be made for continuing the present farm labor recruitment, importation, and placement service with appropriations and authority adequate for the production and harvesting of 1947 planted crops.

STATEMENT OF M. B. GARDNER, REPRESENTING THE NATIONAL FARM LABOR CONFERENCE, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 4, 1947

I am speaking for the Farm Labor Conference which met in Washington January 13 and 14, 1947, and was the outgrowth of a series of meetings which began in June 1946. These meetings were national in character, but intervening, were held regional, State and local meetings to develop the facts and the suggestions of farmer employers throughout the Nation.

There were present at the January meeting, representatives from 21 States, who spoke for practically all of the farmers in the 48 States who employ seasonal labor.

As you gentlemen know, the Federal Farm Labor program was established during the war and has been extended as the needs required. We appear in favor of the latest extension for 1 year proposed in the bill H. R. 1388, introduced by your honorable chairman.

The necessity for extending this program arises from the fact that while the war is over, the employment emergency on the farms of the United States has continued. The Government has figures to show what the needs were in 1946 and how the recruitment and placement of farm workers was carried out. It has been developed by three regional meetings of the Labor Branch and Extension Service, with State and field representatives attending from all States, that the anticipated needs in 1947 are practically the same as existed in 1946.

We support the extension of the Farm Labor program for a full year for several reasons:

The first is that the recruitment and contracting for labor, whether domestic or foreign, has to be well in advance of actual employment, and the repatriation or return home of the laborers requires a period of liquidation extending 3 months or more after the farm employment is terminated. Should such employment continue until the period of extension expires, it would be difficult to liquidate the program and still allow for the completion of the purposes for which the program was established.

Second, the fiscal year of the Federal Government and, therefore, the budget, extends from July to June and that would facilitate the problems of appropriation.

Third, some of the areas like Florida have their seasonal employment which extends into the late winter months so that liquidation in their case could be handled after the completion of the harvest and without interruption or curtailment.

The Farm Labor Conference has studied very carefully all of the problems connected with the Farm Labor program. They have realized that successive extensions of this program, which was originally planned as a war program, cannot be continued indefinitely. The conference has received suggestions from all parts of the country and producers of all types of farm products in regard to the needs, the practical program, and the principles involved. It has been the intention and hope of the Farm Labor Conference that there should be presented to Congress a basic proposal of a more or less permanent nature. This has required considerable time and much progress has been made so that I do not think that I am unduly optimistic when I express the belief that such a proposal may be presented to your committee within a month with the unanimous backing of all farming interests in the country. However, the recruitment of seasonal workers for use on the 1947 crops must be commenced without delay and particularly those in foreign countries where the recruitment would be greatly facilitated if congressional authorization were indicated at the time of negotiating. We understand that the Labor Branch of the Department of Agriculture is preparing to enter negotiations during the month of February. Accordingly, we favor the extension of the present act, Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, which will give the assurance of a continuation of employment under its authority throughout the growing and harvesting seasons of the 1947-48 crops. In the meantime, however, it is the hope of the Farm Labor Conference that we may be successful in presenting to your committee a proposal of a permanent character which can be adopted at this session of Congress so that the extension which we appear to support today may eventually be merged into such permanent program as Congress may authorize.

STATEMENT OF M. B. GARDNER REPRESENTING THE SHADE TOBACCO GROWERS
AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, INC., HARTFORD, CONN.

We wish to go on record as favoring H. R. 1388 covering the extension of the present Farm Labor program to December 31, 1947, with an additional 3 months liquidation period for foreign agricultural workers. We support this extension because we cannot foresee any relief in the employment emergency for agricultural workers in this State.

The members of this association all grow shade tobacco which is urgently needed to meet the cigar manufacturers requirement for wrapper tobacco. Many of the members carry on a diversified agricultural enterprise in addition to growing shade tobacco. Much of the labor needed on the farms, therefore, is used to provide large quantities of food crops and livestock which is still urgently needed throughout the world.

At the peak harvest season during July, August, and September between 18,000 and 20,000 agricultural workers are employed by this association. The majority of these are obtained from local sources. However, to date, there is no indication there will be an adequate number of workers, so we have been forced to place an order for 2,000 Jamaicans and 1,100 out-of-State youth to be supplied under this program. In addition to these, we will attempt to recruit 1,200 to 1,500 southern colored workers, many of these from colleges and high schools. This cannot be accomplished without necessary clearance through the Extension Service, due to laws in Southern States prohibiting recruiting. Due to the long season which we have, southern migrants are not too satisfactory, because by their nature and experience they do not remain in one place for too long a period.

Jamaicans have formed the nucleus of our male labor over the entire growing and harvesting season, during the past 4 years. Many of them have remained during the winter for warehouse work, thus affording year around employment. During the fall months many of our Jamaicans are released to potato, vegetable, and fruit growers to take care of their harvest needs. The employment record for these workers has averaged 98 percent since the program started.

We appreciate that these workers were brought into this country at considerable expense to the Government. We should like to point out for the record that these workers have also been considerable expense to the association, in that the majority of them have been housed in our own camps. These camps were established at a high cost during the war, and have been very costly to maintain and operate. In many instances they have not been the best workers, but until local labor is willing to return to the farms, it will be impossible to maintain our present acreage, and also to produce the 8-percent increase requested by the Department of Agriculture for 1947. We have always operated on the basis that as soon as local labor is available, Jamaicans would be released. This same procedure will be continued this year.

Our position is somewhat different from other areas, in that farms are located in a highly industrial area. Industrial employment still remains at a very high level, and many companies are continually advertising for more help. This State, the same as many others, already has, and will continue to have, postwar projects under way, such as road building, and other State and local projects. These projects will naturally attract some of our present farm labor and limit the available supply of unskilled workers in the State who might otherwise seek farm employment.

Our crop is not one which lends itself to mechanization. It requires about two people per acre to harvest and prepare the crop for the further processing in the warehouse. There is no indication that any of this labor could be satisfactorily replaced by picking machinery.

There are a few general observations which we should like to make in connection with the Farm Labor program as carried on under Public Law 229.

One of the most important things is, we feel, this program has materially benefited the small farmer who uses 6 to 10 workers for a short time during the harvest season. We believe that the placement records of the Federal Extension Service will prove this point. In order to supply this need, the Government has operated camps, transported workers, and generally looked out for the interest of these small operators. The larger users soon found that private housing was more satisfactory, so they have established their own houses, and taken care of their own needs in general. By discontinuing the program during the present agricultural labor shortage, the small farmer would be proportionately hurt a great deal more than the larger operator.

There have been other phases of this program which we feel merit consideration. The Extension Service has carried on a training program for both farmers and employees which has been an invaluable service to both. Through their labor-utilization project they have shown farmers how they can better utilize their labor, and better methods of doing the job. This usually works out that a better job is accomplished; the workers benefit through the savings obtained. Labor has also been trained in better methods of doing certain work which makes the job a great deal easier, and usually the work is more appealing.

Based on our past experience, we do not feel that the State employment services can give satisfactory service to farmers on recruiting and placement of farm labor. In the first place, they are chiefly concerned with industrial employment. Without hiring additional personnel, their staff is not acquainted with farm labor or farmers' problems, both of which are entirely different from industrial requirements. The county agricultural agent is the person nearest to farmers' needs and problems. Because of this fact, the farmers have learned to look to their county agent for their labor needs. Through this program he has been a real service and will continue to be, providing his authority and funds are not removed. If these are, he will be forced to try and do that which will prevent him from doing his other work.

The extension service in our State has worked very closely with the United States Employment Service during the war years. Under this arrangement, persons interested or qualified for agricultural employment were referred to the Extension Service office for placement. Our records show that very few satisfactory farm workers have been so placed who were referred by United States Employment Service. We believe the best example of this situation is New York State. There, the Extension Service had a contract during the war years with the United States Employment Service to handle their local recruitment and placement activities. It is our understanding that the farmers in New York State demanded that this contract should not be renewed for 1947 with the State employment service. They requested the State extension service to do the entire job.

PROCEEDINGS OF SEPTEMBER 1946 SESSIONS OF PROGRAM COMMITTEE, NATIONAL MIGRATORY FARM LABOR CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

To All Users of Migratory Farm Workers:

Meeting in Washington last July a group of farm-labor users, representing 36 States, joined with the three national farm organizations in requesting extension of the emergency farm-labor-supply program to June 30, 1947. They also selected a committee to draft a national program for recruiting and routing domestic farm workers.

This committee, which represented all parts of the Nation, met in Washington, September 9, on call of Chairman W. H. Tolbert, of Portland, Oreg. During its 4 days of deliberation, the needs of users in all States were discussed in detail. Obviously, there were a lot of different ideas expressed. For example, some States wanted full Federal financing, while others wanted to "go it alone." It is a tribute to the committee members that they were able to agree unanimously upon a program. After it has been endorsed or amended, in accordance with the wishes of users, it will be presented to the Congress when it assembles in January.

The consensus of opinion in the Nation, as indicated by the committee members, was that—

1. There should be a national migratory farm-labor program, administered by a single branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, preferably the Federal Extension Service. It would not as a "service" agency, assembling and disseminating information as to labor needs, labor surplus, conditions and terms of employment, housing and other facilities, in the various States; and assist in recruiting in surplus areas.

2. The program should be handled at the State level by the State extension service, with a share of the expenses borne by the Federal Government. This agency would collect information as to labor need, facilities and data, and pass it on to the Federal agency, after it has made a diligent effort to find surplus labor within its own State. It would also assist the Federal agency in recruiting when the State becomes a labor-surplus area.

3. The legislation enacted by the Congress should limit the scope of the Federal agency to purely informational and recruiting functions, specifically operation and integration of the program. In no event would either agency be given the right

to control the movements of either worker or employer, or have the power to fix wages, working conditions, and the like. Neither agency would be authorized to pay transportation costs. The State agency would be authorized to engage in health and recreational programs, and to take over public camps.

4. Authority should be granted to USDA to import foreign workers into the United States, but only in the event there is not an adequate supply of domestic farm labor within the continental United States.

The almost unanimous sentiment was that the Federal agency should be given only such powers as were absolutely necessary. This was not intended as a criticism of the present administration, but to avoid possible future socialization of the program.

The committee members also favored (1) transferring public labor camps to local agencies as soon as feasible; (2) authorizing the Federal land bank and the bank for cooperatives to lend money for building farm-labor housing on private property; (3) training of agricultural workers for their tasks; (4) and in general improving working conditions in farm areas.

It was pointed out that (1) the supply of migratory farm labor will probably be short for years; (2) agriculture must either develop its own recruitment or routing plan or work under one already proposed by the Department of Labor; (3) farm wages will likely remain high even after farm prices have dropped and higher efficiency per worker per day is vitally essential; (4) the best way to obtain a reliable supply of efficient migratory workers is to give them full opportunity to learn where employment is available, the conditions and terms of employment, the housing and social conditions in the community where labor is needed; (5) that agriculture must assure the worker this opportunity or later find itself saddled with a "guaranteed annual wage" plan which could easily wreck the average farmer in one bad crop year.

AUGUST 26, 1946.

To the Members of the State of California Permanent Committee on the Farm Labor Program

GENTLEMEN: I am setting forth herewith a report on the meeting held in Salt Lake City on August 23. I expect to send to you the minutes of the meeting as soon as they are received.

The meeting was opened by the chairman of the western conference, Mr. W. H. Tolbert of Oregon. Each of the various groups was requested to indicate its recommendations. I presented California's recommended outline. This was followed by the reports from the various other States. It soon became apparent that all of the other States were giving consideration to the use of Federal funds for the purpose of recruiting, transporting, and for the medical care of interstate domestic workers. Likewise, it seemed to be the opinion of many people there that the Federal Government should finance the operation of the programs within the various States. Following the reports at the conference, a committee was elected, with a representative from each State, to meet and draw up a series of recommendations. These recommendations are included herewith for your perusal. Again, the matter of the use of Federal funds for the recruiting, transporting, and for the medical care of interstate workers and the matter of financing within the States the operation of a farm-labor program were the principal points of issue. Other than these two issues, very few changes in the original recommendation adopted by you people in San Francisco on July 29 were made. The States of Arizona and California made minority recommendations in both of these instances, and they are reflected in the proposal which is attached.

Considerable discussion was devoted to the matter of which agency would administer the program on a national level. Other States indicated a very definite preference for having the program administered by the Federal Extension Service rather than by the presently organized labor branch.

Those States which were represented at the conference were Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Colorado, Wyoming, Arizona, and California. Most of these people were principally sugar-beet growers (or their representatives), and some of them were potato growers. My personal reaction is that the sugar-beet people were interested in ridding themselves of the responsibility which they have undertaken during the past few years for bringing workers in from other areas.

Accompanying me to the meeting were Mr. William P. Darsie, Mr. F. R. Wileox, Mr. Ellis B. Corem, and Mr. O. R. Moore. It seemed to be the general

consensus of those from California, who attended the conference, that it would not be necessary to call another meeting of the California people until after the Washington meeting, which will be held on September 9. I would, however, be interested in hearing from you as to any suggestions or recommendations you may have to make. Should any of you care to discuss it further with me, I would be pleased to hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

RALPH B. BANJO.

[Pacific Rural Press, October 12, 1946]

A FARM LABOR PROPOSAL

A national program for farm labor has been recommended to the Government at a conference held in Washington. Ralph Banje, manager of the agricultural labor bureau of the San Joaquin Valley, represented California and Arizona at the meeting.

They propose a continuation of a national migratory farm labor program, and want it to continue to be operated by the USDA.

They suggest that the Agricultural Extension Service run it as a service agency, assembling and disseminating information as to labor needs.

At the State level, they want the Extension Service to operate with a share of the expense borne by the Federal Government. The State agency would get all possible labor within the State, and then call upon the Federal service.

They make it plain that there should be no control over the movements of labor or wages or working conditions. The agency wouldn't undertake to pay any transportation costs. They would merely make studies of where labor is needed and pass out that information to prospective labor for farm work.

When and if home labor can't be located, they want the Government to continue to bring in foreign labor under the terms which have been quite successful during the war.

It is hoped that such a program may be authorized by Congress and be able to take over when the present law expires June 30, of next year. In other words, a program for peace will take over where the program for war left off.

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE BOARD OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS,

ITHACA, N. Y., February 8, 1947.

Re Farm Labor Program

To New York State Representatives in Congress:

DEAR SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN: We are taking this opportunity to inform you of the recommendations of the farm labor committee of the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations.

In July 1940 the New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations appointed the New York State Agricultural Defense Committee to help meet the problems of war, including farm labor shortage.

This State agricultural defense committee played a very important part in correlating the efforts of various groups and agencies concerned with the farm labor shortage and in developing policies under which our farm labor program has been most successful.

Following the war some of the functions of our agricultural defense committee, other than farm labor, were no longer needed and the committee was dissolved.

The New York State Conference Board of Farm Organizations then appointed a thoroughly representative subcommittee on farm labor to help guide the farm labor program from this point on. All of the members of this committee are outstanding farmers representing all of our major types of production and all of them are participants and leaders in the farm labor program. Practically all of them have had broad experience in the employment of local, migrant, and foreign workers.

The chairman of our committee on farm labor is John Hall, of Lockport, (Niagara County) N. Y. Mr. Hall is a large fruit grower and he has employed large numbers of local, migrant, and foreign workers. He is vice president of the Lockport Farmers' Cooperative Association which is a farm labor cooperative.

This committee has recommended the following:

(1) That the contract between the Extension Service and the Employment Service to recruit and place farm workers be discontinued when it expires. (Contract expired December 31, 1946.)

(2) That the Extension Service perform directly the services previously performed by the Employment Service under contract with Extension Service pending any changes that Congress may make.

Our farm labor committee is of the opinion that as rapidly as possible the mechanical problem of recruiting and placing labor should be shifted from government to farmers and farm labor cooperatives. The committee is convinced that there is a permanent need for a great deal of educational service in the years ahead in helping farmers to meet this problem, including the routing of migrant workers from the point of recruitment to the point of employment and return.

The committee believes that a continuous educational program by the Extension Service is needed with the farm labor cooperatives and with individual growers in connection with such things as proper housing and feeding of migrants, work efficiency and labor utilization, employer-worker and worker-community relationships. The committee believes that such educational guidance is essential to the efficient operation of our labor cooperatives which are under the management and operation of growers.

Foreign workers have been used quite extensively in our state. Our farm labor committee is of the opinion that some foreign workers will still be needed in this area in 1947 but is convinced that this part of the program should be eliminated as soon as feasible.

We are very much interested in the Hope resolution (H. R. 1388). We are urging that it be reported out of committee and acted upon favorably in the near future so that our farmers may know how to plan their 1947 operations.

In the opinion of our farm labor committee, the Extension Service, with the experience it has gained, is the proper agency to administer the farm labor program.

It is our observation that farmers in general throughout the state are opposed to placing responsibility for administering the farm labor program in regulatory departments such as the Federal and State Departments of Labor.

Sincerely yours,

NEW YORK STATE CONFERENCE BOARD
OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS,
E. S. FOSTER, *Secretary*.

ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES,

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 27, 1947.*

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HOPE: Dean Thomas Cooper of the College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky, who is chairman of the executive committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, has asked that a resolution adopted by the executive body of the association, composed of the presidents of the land-grant institutions, be brought to the attention of your committee at the time of its hearing on H. R. 1388 to extend the farm-labor program through June 30, 1948.

The resolution recognizes the undesirability of transferring administration of the program to some other agency than the Agricultural Extension Service in the middle of the summer harvest season, as would be the case if the program were terminated as of June 30, 1947, or transferred to some other agency at that time, but expresses a request that the Extension Service be relieved of the recruitment phases of the program as soon as possible.

There was at the Chicago meeting no action with respect to simple extension of the present program for a year, and the executive committee of the association will not meet again until February 10, 11, and 12, in Washington.

The resolution adopted at Chicago is as follows:

"Whereas it is apparent that the need for foreign farm labor to supplement our domestic labor supply is diminishing, but continuance of a recruitment program in the farm-labor field beyond July 1, 1947, seems probable, and

"Whereas present Federal legislation places responsibility for recruitment of emergency farm labor upon the Agricultural Extension Service until July 1, 1947; and

"Whereas this association has stated its belief that recruitment of farm labor is not a proper function of the Agricultural Extension Service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the association reiterates its previous request that the Agricultural Extension Service be relieved of responsibility for the farm-labor recruitment program as soon as possible, recognizing the fact that if the program is continued beyond July 1, 1947, transfer to another agency in the middle of the harvest season would not be desirable or practicable from the standpoint of the farmer or farm worker; and be it further

Resolved, That the association recommends that the educational program of the Agricultural Extension Service, associated with farm labor and including labor-management and labor-savings devices and methods, be continued and enlarged upon."

Respectfully,

RUSSELL I. THACKREY,
Executive Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., February 4, 1947.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We are informed that on hearing on H. R. 1388, opposition developed and suggestion made that operations under 229 be discontinued and whole problem be relegated to the States. We are absolutely opposed to this suggestion and urge the passage of H. R. 1388 and the extension of 229 as being absolutely essential if the crops in the State of Washington are to be planted and harvested this coming crop season, and irreparable loss will result unless program embodied in 229 is continued. Our State agencies are not equipped to handle the problem on any other basis, and to vary the program will simply mean that during this crop season we will lose the indispensable labor supply made available through existing program under 229. Details of long-range program can be worked out later in permanent bill and we are prepared to cooperate in the study and drafting of permanent program. But it is absolutely essential that existing program carried on through Agricultural Department be continued through present crop season. Have canvassed this situation with representatives of State USES, pea growers, apple growers, and processors, and we are unanimous in urging your vigorous support of H. R. 1388. Your active interest in this program will be much appreciated.

Washington State Governor's Farm Labor Committee; Associated Producers & Packers, Inc.; Stanwood Farm Labor Committee; Snohomish Farm Labor Committee; Skagit Farm Labor Committee; Northwest Cannery Association; Tree Fruit State-wide Labor Committee; T. M. Wade Fruit Co.; Beebe Orchard Co., care of R. J. Venables, 1044 Henry Building, Seattle, Wash.

HOLLAND, MICH., February 13, 1947.

Congressman BARTEL JONKMAN,

Senate Office Building:

We ask your support of H. R. 1388, which extends the recruiting and supervision of the agricultural labor program under the United States Department of Agriculture. The Federal and State extension service will be able to continue with the cooperative handling of agricultural workers for the thousands of farmers needing transient labor. This temporary legislation which should become permanent makes agricultural leaders throughout the country the farmer-labor contact representatives. This is as it should be. We will appreciate your aid in securing the passage of this bill.

HEINZ GROWERS EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE, INC.

HEINZ GROWERS EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE, INC.,

Saginaw, Mich., February 13, 1947.

Mr. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,

*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: Practically all of our farmers would feel that the handling of the farm labor supply, including the procurement and supervision at present, should

be through the USDA and the State extension services. This refers to labor which assists in the production and harvesting of agricultural products.

We therefore trust that you will enthusiastically work for the passing of the bill (H. R. 1388) to continue for 12 months the current farm labor supply program administered by the Department of Agriculture.

Yours respectfully,

HEINZ GROWERS EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE, INC.
By A. E. HILDEBRAND, *Executive Secretary*.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE J. BOURG, REPRESENTING THE FARMERS AND MANUFACTURERS BEET-SUGAR ASSOCIATION OF SAGINAW, MICH., RE: HEARINGS ON H. R. 1388, BEGINNING FEBRUARY 4, 1947, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

The requirements for laborers in the sugar industry are as critical and as uncertain in 1947 as they were in 1946. Contracting of beet acreage is now going on and the growers are asking for assurances that they will have labor to thin and block as well as to harvest the crop. Unless those assurances are made positive by the extension of the farm-labor program, there will definitely be great reductions in the plantings of sugar-beet seed.

The report on the sugar situation of the Andresen subcommittee recognizes the need for Government assistance on labor, fertilizer, and farm machinery. The most practical assistance which can be offered under present conditions would be the extension of Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended.

In order to bring about a maximum production of sugar, the Secretary of Agriculture has established a goal of 1,069,000 acreage for sugar beets. This total figure has been broken down to goals for each State, so that Michigan has a goal of 140,000; Ohio, 35,000; Wisconsin, 17,000; Illinois, 3,000; and Indiana, 500; making a total of 195,500 for the eastern beet area.

Using the measure of labor needs, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, one laborer is needed for each 10 acres. This would mean a total of 19,550 for the area.

Using the case of Michigan as an example, the acreage goal is 140,000, which will require 14,000 workers.

Estimates have been set up for each State as to the needs for foreign workers at the time of harvest and 3,500 has been set as the figure for foreign workers to be used in Michigan during October (the peak month) leaving 10,500 workers to be recruited locally and from domestic sources.

There were 8,253 workers recruited from domestic sources in 1946 for work in Michigan which took care of 112,000 acres in sugar beets as well as other crops such as pickles, cherries, apples, and other fruits and vegetables.

If Michigan is to respond to the appeal for a maximum crop of sugar to satisfy the consumption requirements of the United States, then foreign workers are necessary to the full extent of the 3,500 estimated in addition to the local workers and those recruited from other States. The needs for the eastern beet area will be in proportion.

To whatever extent these foreign workers are made available to our farmers, the problems of recruiting farm workers from other States will be reduced. If there should be no foreign workers recruited, the competition for domestic farm workers will be greatly increased and made much more difficult. In like manner, sugar production in the United States would be correspondingly reduced and the consumers of the Nation would become the chief sufferers since relief for them depends very greatly upon the United States mainland production.

Gradually the planting and harvesting of sugar beets is becoming mechanized. Great progress is being made, but the manufacture of these machines has been very slow. Again it becomes a question of how soon mechanical planters and harvesters will take the place of hand labor. The time is perhaps near at hand, but the prospects in 1947 are for only a partial realization of the mechanization that is expected in 1948 and in future years.

Progress is being made, but we have to ask for assistance and encouragement on the labor supply to see us through the transition period toward full mechanization. That is the only way the sugar bowls of America can be kept reasonably filled.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be glad to hear now from Mr. George Wilson, American Farm Bureau Federation, Clarksburg, Calif.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE WILSON, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA FARM
BUREAU OF THE AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, my name is George Wilson. I am a farmer living at Clarksburg, Calif. I am a director of the California Farm Bureau of the American Farm Bureau Federation; also since the spring of 1942 I have been vice chairman of the California Farm Products Council, which is an agency set up by the State of California to assist in any way we could in helping the production of farm crops throughout the war; and I have specialized primarily in giving assistance to getting farm labor during the war.

Shortly after we were set up the act which we are now discussing was set up by Congress and with the Extension Service coming into the picture to handle the local farm labor.

We entered into a definite agreement with the Extension Service and with the Office of Labor from Washington whereby we would handle the problems connected with the housing and transportation of farm labor and the Extension Service would handle the recruitment and placement and, of course, the office of farm labor would handle the importations. I mention that because I am not a professor.

We spend 1 or 2 days a month on the determination of policies and have a staff. The State of California gave us originally \$1,800,000 to assist in that program. They have since given us, I think, about \$2,500,000, of which we are returning on June 30 about \$3,000,000 because we have operated the thing on a cost basis.

Reference has been made to everything that farmers get out of this program. I know of no money from this appropriation being spent for any housing for any farm labor in the State of California; all of that has been spent by the farmers themselves. They have spent. I don't have the figures here of what they spent for housing because I was here on other matters and did not contemplate appearing on this matter, but they have gotten a good deal of surplus housing since the war is over and they have put on the farms housing of a value of about \$10,000,000, which has been purchased by the farmers.

We don't want and we don't like imported farm labor. We don't like farm labor which operates under Government regulations and restrictions. The Government does, I might say, inspect all houses which are to be occupied by any of this imported labor, and the houses must meet a standard set before they will move the labor in, and to that I have no complaint. That is, we would rather have a State agency establish the quality of housing which could be used rather than a Federal agency, but with having some agency we certainly have no complaint with that.

I might call the attention of the committee to the fact that one of the reasons we are here today is because the Congress of the United States—and I don't say that critically of Congress and the people of the United States—they have insisted on such a tight immigration program throughout the years. While we have tried to keep everything else so closely restricted, that with agriculture unrestricted, that agriculture has not had access to those immigrants that we have normally had access to throughout many years as originally farm workers, tenants and finally farm owners, and that is what most of our farmers are today—the immigrants of some years ago. If we had that we certainly would not ask for a program.

You passed a bill a couple of years ago which along with this program which we have discussed also provided that employers might go into Mexico—at least that is a country I am more familiar with—and that we might recruit in Mexico at our own expense and bring the men in. That is in this law. Other branches of the Federal Government, however, prevented that entirely. We would have been very happy to have gone into Mexico and have recruited these men ourselves and brought them in rather than to have had the Federal Government do it, or, maybe, I should say in addition to the Federal Government doing it, but you do have that very definite problem as between the larger producer and the smaller producer—one producer who can afford either due to the size of his operations or the nature of it, whereby he can keep the men employed continuously 6 to 8 months, can afford to go into Mexico and recruit and bring the men in but the man, be he large or small, who only needs the men to pick a crop of peas or a crop of peaches only a month, cannot afford to bring in a crew from Mexico. Unless you have months of work you cannot afford to recruit in Mexico.

The complications, however, arise where you have the Immigration Service of the State Department. We should arrange to have a cooperative arrangement and then the Farmers Cooperative Labor Organization could go into Mexico and arrange for the importing of the workers, and I think they would be very happy to do it even though we had to get approval from the Secretary of Agriculture, or of the State Department to import them—I mean our California folks—before we could go in. We would have to convince them of the need before we could bring them in. We still would be happy to do it if the State Department would permit it. I think that is something right there, that they would enter objections to so many people going down there.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you a question right there?

I understand in the case of Mexico, the Mexican Government has made certain requirements that could not be met by private individuals or associations?

Mr. WILSON. We heard that same statement, Congressman, and when I, in my position as a farmer, go to differentiate between what the American Government said and what the Mexican Government said I just do not know. We get the statements. We do not understand the situation but we do know that we cannot go like we did before. It was the Federal policy that we should not go.

The CHAIRMAN. In any event it was not made operative. You would have been glad to go as you did before?

Mr. WILSON. That is right, and if we had the normal relations that we had 12 to 15 years ago whereby they permitted folk to come across the border, we could operate all right. The borders have been closed so this is the only method of getting accomplished what many, many years before was a relatively free movement across the border, which now has been entirely stopped by Federal action, so if it must be resumed, it must be resumed by Federal action to get back to normal relations that we had before.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. What objection would the Federal Government have to having the importation of foreign labor carried on by the State governments? Say the State or California?

Mr. WILSON. There would be no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If the State of California has need for foreign labor, let the State make the arrangements for them?

Mr. WILSON. Of course, Congressman, I just cannot speak for the State Department.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Why not let the States take care of it?

Mr. WILSON. I think the two things—I cannot speak for the State Department, I could not. The other thing is the problem of foreign labor, which is more simple for California than it is for those States which are at some distance from Mexico and not adjacent to Mexico. So what I am trying to point out is this: First, we are concerned, and I am sure we are handling it. The thing I am trying to point out the only reason there is a problem is because agencies of this Government have prevented these other methods of bringing Mexicans across either at our request or the request of the Mexicans.

My Mexican boss' father and mother sat on the lower side of the line for about 8 months. He had money in his pocket and with a desire to work. He was a farmer and had sold his place in Mexico, wanting to come up here to his son, with a good position assured and plenty of money. It took 8 months before they got across.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You spoke of restrictions imposed on men who wanted to go down and get men to work for you in California? Those were wartime restrictions were they not, put on during the war?

Mr. WILSON. They are still in existence, Congressman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When you investigate do you not think that they will end when the war is declared over?

Mr. WILSON. They have not gone out of operation at this point following the war and we have had no indication of any change of policy. In fact we have got what you call wet backs in California, who are presumably fellows who swim the river and get in from Mexico irregularly.

The Immigration Service, which very kindly and considerately in connection with the labor agencies of the Government have looked rather lightly on these fellows who have come in so irregularly, and have not been too insistent on sending them out during the war, but they are now getting active and picking up those fellows quite rapidly, so it would not indicate we would have access to any. It indicates we would have access to less since the war rather than more.

Mr. CLEVINGER. We have heard a great deal about the movement of Americans to California and good hard-working people who heard you had a lovely climate in California, and they moved there from Oklahoma and Arkansas. You have had people come there in great numbers. What is the situation about their working on the farms and in the orchards? Have they become rich and no longer willing to work as orchardists?

Mr. WILSON. The younger folk of that group are now doing the tractor work largely and other work which we depended on other people doing. They are making very fine people. A great many went in industry, and when industries closed down we thought they would return home, but they stayed. We thought many of them would be available for agriculture as soon as the war was over.

Actually our population has been increasing very rapidly and those people are still coming in very large numbers. It looks like they are being taken care of and more are coming in than are leaving.

We in California are in a very explosive position. They are steadily coming in now. The number coming in exceeds the number going out by more than 1,000 a day.

Mr. CLEVENGER. You would rather have that number, wouldn't you?

Mr. WILSON. By all means, but they are not going in for agricultural labor for the reason that our demand for industrial labor is still far beyond anything we have anticipated, and they are either idle or going in industrial plants.

If we should have a recession in business in that area we would head for a tremendous number of idle folk who will be thrown back on the farm in relation to this whole measure we are now discussing.

The counsel I referred to, who is official adviser to the Extension Service in handling labor programs, and we stay in close touch with it. About 3 months ago we took action to the effect that we should retain the Mexicans we now have in the State during the harvest period for citrus which is this early spring, but should return them as rapidly as convenient and not continue them after June 30.

We have, however, recently had a survey of the whole situation, and it just seems to us that while it is exceedingly explosive if we had a recession we could have a great number of folks available in California for the farms, and I think that has always been the situation in California, but they are not available now. That we have about 18,000 in the State at the present time. We are now at the low period of agricultural demand—about 100,000. At our peak of agricultural demand we need about 225,000 to 230,000. We just cannot see how we could be justified returning this 16,000 or possibly 18,000 to Mexico at a time when we are just approaching our high demand, when we will need about 225,000 and so we are quite anxious that this program be retained primarily so that the number now in the States can remain, and that we can have provisions whereby we can have some increase if it becomes essential, for if the conditions as of today continue we certainly will need them, and we cannot get folks other than these people to do the type of work and in the volume and in the amount that will need to be done.

If, however, we have any recession of business, then certainly we will want the program in effect so that we would immediately return those Mexicans and they will not become a burden upon the local people.

As I say, 3 months ago we did not feel we needed to continue, but after our survey in January and after our meeting in January on the subject, we could not come to any conclusion except that we should continue it.

Considerable reference has been made to State agencies as compared to Federal agencies. I think that certainly one can say for the Farm Bureau Federation that our desire is a minimum of Federal participation. I think there was a good deal of difference in the use of words here in that we felt that the Extension Service was a local agency and think of it as such, because even though the money may be federally appropriated it originally was a grant-in-aid and administered locally. I think the question raised is local and the Extension Service should handle the work. I think in New York extension isn't handled there but they turn it over to the United States Employment Service, and that is one of the reasons, I think, why you had the outside folks in New York, whereas you did not have them in other States.

Mr. GROSS. I was talking about Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILSON. I understood you were northern New York. We have offices with too many folks in them. There is no question about it. I do not know where there are any offices which are not that way.

Mr. CLEVINGER. In Ohio last year, Mr. Murray encouraged a CIO-PAC farm movement. Do you think that would be good in Ohio?

Mr. WILSON. I don't care to comment on that. I might say our failing is the State employment service and the United States Employment Service.

Now where are our United States employment services as they have existed in the past? They have been located primarily in the cities because they have been primarily to furnish industrial labor. I don't think there is anything wrong or unusual that union organized labor should have considerable to say about those employment agencies. I don't think it is going to change as long as you employ industrial labor.

While we are not discussing it today, but I would like to discuss with any of you men whether the man is getting more money in industry or more in agriculture. I say he will get more in agriculture and he will live better in agriculture on the wages paid than on the wages he will get in industry, and that is true even where they are paying a wage of \$2 an hour. I checked it many times. We do need to dignify farm labor and pay them more money.

The problem connected with displaced people is new to me, and if there is something we can use, we should use them. It is the most natural thing in the world, but even though we have done this large amount of work and put on over 8,000 housing units that the farmers bought through the council in the last year and a half, still we are not adequately equipped to furnish housing for families. Our housing proper has been built around the employment of single men, and it is still hard to get proper housing on the farms adequate for family use. It is something we are trying to do very rapidly and maybe we can do something on displaced persons.

Mr. CLEVINGER. In 30 years there has been practically nil immigration to the farms and yet some of the finest, hard-working people in the world have been colonized in our cities—Toledo and many other cities—and we have not been getting them on the farms in the last 30 to 40 years, since prior to the First World War. They do not go to the country now.

Mr. WILSON. Isn't it because they are gregarious? They are like Merino sheep that pack together without a herder.

Mr. CLEVINGER. It would be no relief to the farmer to open the immigration quota?

Mr. WILSON. It is with Mexico. They would come over rapidly.

Mr. CLEVINGER. But you would like to have them and then send them back if there was a business recession?

Mr. WILSON. It is a big asset not only to the farmers but to the American economy or to our California economy if we can use as our surplus labor folks that we can send back very quickly if we were to have an industrial recession. Yes; that is true. That is a benefit to the State far more than the farmer.

You may be interested in knowing what we pay these Mexican laborers. The minimum we pay them is 80 cents an hour. In

addition to that we have to pay them a minimum of \$1.50 a day for every day they do not work on account of rain, weather, or anything else, which covers their board. We have to pay them \$3 a day or maybe more than that unless we work them a certain amount.

We have many requirements that are placed upon us by the law, placed upon us in the employment of this labor. They are more expensive than ordinary labor; they are less efficient than our own domestic labor. They do have an advantage of maybe a dozen of them coming in at a time and take them out when you are done with them. However, we would certainly prefer normal channels of labor, and normal channels would be cheaper because we don't have so many "hanging baskets" to go into and bills.

Just recently I got a bill for \$180 that I know is not right. It is 2 years old. They claim I did not pay them 2 years ago or something. There was never a complaint from the labor. It is just a matter of records. We have lots of records to keep and we don't want them. Mr. Chairman, we have got to harvest our crops and we must get our labor some place.

Mr. PACE. I believe you stated at the outset that there was no housing provided by the Federal Government?

Mr. WILSON. I said not in California. We have in California some camps placed by Farm Security and were under the Farm Security appropriation.

Mr. PACE. They worked under this program?

Mr. WILSON. Well, now, we had no thought of them as such. I was in error if they were under this program.

Mr. PACE. As a member of the FSA Investigating Committee I did not visit them but those who did said that your State was honey-combed with labor camps.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; but these camps were set up by associations of farmers who rented their camps from California Production Council, and some purchased those camps. Often the cost for a normal-sized camp was about \$12,000 to \$15,000, and if it is to be put in permanently the State appropriated about \$3,000 normally for such a camp.

Mr. PACE. It occurs to me that under the FHA Act these labor camps were to be disposed of within 6 months after official declaration of the end of the hostilities, and now in the bill before the committee you propose to amend that law to keep these labor camps in connection with this next program you are talking about. I don't understand.

Mr. WILSON. I was in error, Congressman Pace, because I did not think of the Farm Security camps being a part of this program. I understood they were put in this bill. There were one or two other camps built in California after this program came into effect. They were retained, however. The only camps which became available to us were some guayule camps which the Forest Service had and several others that became available to us.

A number of relief camps also became available to us. Then, too, a number of National Guard camps became available to us, and we bought some, and we are using those.

Mr. PACE. You are taking advantage of these camps, then?

Mr. WILSON. We are still using the Farm Security camps which were built prior to the war.

The Federal Government did not build any camps in California to take care of the Mexicans brought in under the program.

Mr. PACE. Well you know this bill, Mr. Wilson, is supposed to amend the present law. It authorizes the construction of additional labor camps at a cost of not exceeding \$20,000 per camp, and if they did not build any it was the first time we ever authorized the Federal Government to do that that they did not spend it.

Mr. WILSON. I am limiting my remarks solely to California, and I will still stand on that; they probably did not in California because we had the State agency which did something.

Mr. PACE. You are telling the committee that the population in California is increasing at the rate of 1,000 per day over and above your normal birth rate.

Mr. WILSON. That is right; practically.

Mr. PACE. And that you still think that there will not be in California enough labor to meet your needs on the farms of California?

Mr. WILSON. That was the result of the survey taken during the month of January and resulted in a change of opinion on the part of both the Extension Service and this Farm Products Council made up of seven farmers of the State that I referred to. I mention it because we had felt that we could take care of it in 1947 so that we are not using it now, but just wanting it done. After that survey we could not help but revise our opinion. I have the fullest respect for its opinion because its opinion was the same as ours before we made the survey. We had to come to the conclusion we will have definite losses if we do not have some outside assistance.

Mr. PACE. This gives you a chance to play safe in respect to 16,000 or 18,000, does it not?

Mr. WILSON. I can very well imagine my sitting here today asking for a continuation of this program. If we have a business recession we certainly will be for not using any of the money. Take sugar. I really think we are first or second in the production of sugar. Regardless of what you say about other commodities a large part of the labor is used in sugar. We must increase our sugar acreage next year. We cannot do it unless we have some assurance of the labor.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In regard to the increase of population, you have 1,000 people coming in every day in addition to the increase in the birth rate?

Mr. WILSON. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You say those people are being absorbed by California?

Mr. WILSON. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do you mean to tell us that these industries like airplane factories that are not producing airplanes like they did during the war and the great plants are not producing now like they did during the war when, now when these people for the last 6 months or a year have been surplus people and with nothing to do, with no places to live, that they are still living there? Do you mean that with that drop in industry you are still having a surplus of 1,000 a day?

Mr. WILSON. Yes. We have now one of the largest furniture factories and one of the largest clothing industries that there is in the United States. A large part of the change has developed since the war. We have numbers of places building stoves and all kinds of things of that kind which have been developed during the war.

It has been just as much a marvel to us as to anyone because we certainly did not anticipate it. These people stayed and they have been absorbed. They are absorbed too.

We are tremendously short of housing, and that is a tremendous problem on account of this, as you can well guess, but they have been absorbed in industry. Their unemployment loads are very low and our unemployed is very low in the State at the present time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You have just about convinced us to move out to California. Industry is going there and that is the place for all to go.

Mr. WILSON. We certainly are not advertising. We are not in a position to ask for any more.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything further, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. No; I just might show this red line, as you can see [indicating], which is a chart of our labor demands. It is a bad situation in many ways to have an industry which has such a fluctuating demand for labor. We are doing everything we can to try to beat her. Here [indicating] we are at 100,000. Here [indicating] we get below 100,000. Here [indicating] we get up above 225,000. Here [indicating] is where we are now with 16,000 Mexicans employed. We will be in trouble here [indicating] if we do not go ahead with this program. We would like to get rid of them now but we cannot see how we can do it with the number of people seeking employment with industry. There is no possible way to meet the situation unless we would retain those we now have and unless we have the possibility, if we need them, of some additional help to take care of this pick up here [indicating].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Do you mean financial help?

Mr. WILSON. No; the California Farm Products Council will lend to the State \$3,000,000. We could use it for this if we wanted to but cannot use it under the law.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How about the money of the Federal Government? Are you willing to return that?

Mr. WILSON. The Federal law will not permit us at our expense to go in Mexico to recruit and bring out labor. If we had such a law it would be of more and more assistance than it was when you passed that law before, unless along with that were a change of national policy which will permit us to do it. So you see we are caught between the devil and the deep blue sea.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I imagine if Congress enacts a national policy that the State Department will bow to the will of Congress.

Mr. WILSON. Maybe you will have to reword it. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like for the record to show that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Murray, was excused on account of an important conference at the Department of Agriculture. Let the record show that.

The committee will now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

(Thereupon the committee adjourned to meet on Wednesday, February 5, 1947, at 10 a. m.)

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee on Agriculture met in the committee room, 1310 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Hon. Clifford R. Hope (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We will proceed with further consideration of H. R. 1388, and I am going to call first on Colonel Buie. Colonel Buie is in charge of the foreign-labor program.

I want him to tell us in particular of the surveys which have been made this year as to the need for continuation of the farm labor supply placement program. I would like you, Colonel Buie, to give us that information and other pertinent information relative to the need for continuation of this program as has been brought to your attention.

State to the stenographer your name and official position with the Department, so we have it for the record.

STATEMENT OF WILSON R. BUIE, DIRECTOR, LABOR BRANCH, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Chairman, my name is Wilson R. Buie. I am the Director of the Labor Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture.

I have been with this branch almost since its inception, since May 1943, having been detailed from the Corps of Engineers; that is, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in which capacity I served as a colonel in the Corps of Engineers until my physical discharge last March. At that time I was retained in a civilian capacity to perform the duties of the directorship.

We have just completed a series of meetings throughout the country. By "we" I mean the Labor Branch in conjunction with the Federal Extension Service and the several State extension services. These meetings were held first in Salt Lake City, second in Chicago, and third in Atlantic City. The meetings are an annual affair, or have been an annual affair, in the performance of the functions of this office, the Labor Branch, the purpose being to survey, as late as possible and as early as possible in the near year, or prior to planning, the need for agricultural labor.

Those meetings are attended by farm labor supervisors, and in many instances the State directors of extension throughout the coun-

try, in order that they may submit to the Labor Branch their thinking as to the probable needs in the cultivation and harvesting of the necessary food and fiber crops.

The meeting at Salt Lake City was held February 15 and extended over 3 days. Then we moved into Chicago a week later, and finally into Atlantic City on the 28th and 29th of January. That in itself brings this survey up to the very latest moment.

There was an over-all request or indication that 90,000 foreign workers would be required throughout the United States in the coming year for agricultural purposes. I have that summarized, and I also have it broken down by States, Mr. Chairman. Would you care for me to go into the details of it, or would the over-all summary of the operational division be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have it in a form in which you could put it in the record?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you do it this way: Give us the figures in the over-all statement, and then if members wish to inquire as to a particular State, you can give those figures.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. But he will put the complete statement in the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUIE. I will be glad to do so.

(The following statement shows by States and by months the estimated number of foreign workers needed during 1947:)

Preliminary request for foreign workers by month submitted by the State Extension Service during January 1947

Division	Type worker	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
I													
Connecticut	West Indian	1,050	1,050	1,050	1,600	2,050	2,050	2,050	2,200	2,200	2,200	1,000	1,000
Delaware	do	100	100	100	150	200	250	500	500	500	400	100	100
Maine	do									100	100		
Maryland	Canadian									4,000	4,000		
Massachusetts	West Indian	200	200	200	300	600	1,200	1,700	1,700	1,700	1,200	500	200
New Hampshire	do					150	150	150	150	250	250	50	50
	do					100	100	100	100	100	100		
New Jersey	West Indian	100	100	200	800	1,200	1,500	1,800	2,000	2,000	1,500	750	500
New York	do	300	300	300	750	750	1,400	1,600	1,700	1,900	1,800	300	300
Pennsylvania	do				350	350	400	400	600	600	600	400	
Vermont	do						100	100	100				
	Canadian								100				
Total		1,750	1,750	1,850	3,500	5,400	7,150	8,400	9,050	13,550	12,350	3,150	2,100
II													
Florida	West Indian	7,000	7,000	7,000	6,800	6,100	3,400	3,300	3,300	3,300	3,300	5,300	5,300
Georgia	do				150	150	500	500					
North Carolina	do						500	1,200	1,200	800	200		
Tennessee	do							250	250	250			
Virginia	do					100	500	500	400	900	900	450	
Total		7,000	7,000	7,000	6,950	6,350	4,900	5,750	5,150	5,250	4,400	5,750	5,300
III													
Illinois	Mexican				100	500	800	600	800	800	100		
	West Indian					400	900	400	900	900	500	100	
Indiana	Mexican					75	100						
	West Indian					75	100						
Iowa	Mexican				150	200	200	900	900	300	300	150	
	do					400	400	400	150	150	400	400	
Kansas	do					250	250	200	250	700	1,100	1,100	
Louisiana	West Indian	200	200	250	250	250	250	200	2,300	2,300	2,800	1,200	1,100
Michigan	Mexican	100	100	100	100	1,500	2,000	2,000	2,300	2,300	2,800	1,200	100
	West Indian	150	150	150	150	500	500	500	700	700	700	300	100
Minnesota	Mexican					1,250	2,600	2,600	2,200	3,000	2,000		
	West Indian						500	500	300	500	500		
Missouri	do	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75	75
Nebraska	Mexican	150	150	150	150	400	3,500	2,500	1,000	1,000	2,000	1,000	500
North Dakota	do					200	200	200		750	900		
	Canadian									1,000	1,000		

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Preliminary request for foreign workers by month submitted by the State Extension Service during January 1947—Continued

Division	Type worker	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
III—Continued	West Indian.....	100	100	100	100	200	250	300	400	600	800	400	100
	Mexican.....						1,000	1,000	100	100	1,000	100	
	do.....						1,000	1,400	1,400	1,400	500	300	
	West Indian.....						1,300	1,400	1,400	1,400	850	100	
Total		775	775	825	1,075	6,025	15,675	14,975	12,875	15,675	15,525	5,225	2,075
IV	Mexican.....					5,000	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	5,000	
	Idaho.....					3,750	3,750	1,500	1,500	2,500	3,500	2,000	
	Montana.....					4,000	4,000	4,000			4,000	4,000	
	Oregon.....					900	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,000	1,700	
	Utah.....					1,800	1,800	1,800	1,500	1,800	1,800	1,000	
	Washington.....				300	800	1,500	2,000	1,000	1,800	1,200	500	
	Wyoming.....					1,400	2,400	200	200	2,400	2,400	500	
	Total				300	17,650	19,950	16,000	5,700	15,000	18,900	11,700	
V	Mexican.....	1,800	1,600	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,600	1,600	1,300	1,400	1,500	2,500	2,500
	California.....	20,000	25,000	30,000	34,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	25,000	25,000
	Nevada.....	100	100	200	200	200	200	350	350	200	400	200	100
	New Mexico.....					250	250	250	250	500	500	1,000	
	Total	21,900	26,700	31,700	35,700	36,950	37,050	37,200	37,900	38,100	38,400	28,700	27,600
United States total (all types)		31,425	36,225	41,375	47,525	72,375	84,725	82,325	70,675	87,575	89,575	53,525	36,075
	Mexican.....	23,200	22,000	32,900	38,100	61,175	68,800	64,800	52,550	62,900	67,300	53,550	28,200
	West Indian.....	8,225	8,225	8,475	9,425	11,100	15,725	17,325	17,925	19,575	17,175	10,975	8,875
	Canadian.....					100	200	200	200	500	500	1,000	

We have divided the country into five operational divisions. Division 1 is made up of Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Vermont.

The peak month or need for that division is September. Those States have requested or indicated to us that they will need 13,550 foreign workers, or workers from outside of the State, to augment their own supply of migratory workers, and their intrastate workers, in order to meet their needs for the year 1947.

Mr. PACE. How does that compare with their requests for 1946 and 1945, Colonel?

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Pace, I haven't that comparative data here, but I possibly can give you an idea of what the final result is as we view these figures. Mr. Butler has come to my assistance and he will look first and see if I can pick it up. Do you want to know what the reduction is?

Mr. PACE. For the past 20 years this need for farm workers has always been met and supplied by domestic labor. I think the attitude of your office should be that of distinct opposition to bringing in foreign workers to perform local work when there is an ample supply of unemployed people in this country. For instance, there has always been a need here. We always have brought in outside domestic workers in certain periods at the height of the season. There is one distinct service which has been carried on in the past that I think can be continued without this program, and that is the supplementing of funds to be used by the local county agents in securing labor within their own counties. I think funds should be supplied county agents to get the local labor mobilized, we will say, and moved out on the farms during the rush season. That can be continued throughout the States or counties if necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. There is only a limited amount of local labor. You do have that situation in the South, but in some of the other areas they do not have a sufficient amount of labor.

Mr. PACE. My idea is that we have large cities in the East like Baltimore, and when the rush season comes, say for the potato harvest, at that particular time the county agents with one or two assistants, they can go out and solicit labor. They meet at the courthouse and the labor gathers there. Then the farmers come with their trucks and take the labor out to the farms and work them. I cannot believe but that there are plenty of people in the great State of Maryland, if the need was brought to their attention and accommodations were provided, who would take care of that situation. Then, too, you say that 13,000 are needed in that entire area, comprising some of our greatest States. Do you mean to tell me, Colonel, that the population there, that is probably 50,000,000 or at least 40,000,000 easily, that the county agents in those States are unable to get 13,000 people to move out on the farms and supplement the local labor?

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Pace, I think there might be some confusion or misunderstanding about foreign labor. When I am referring to foreign labor I am referring to those people that the States have determined they will need in addition to their own people, and that was brought about as a result of the State extension services making a survey of the available interstate workers.

When I say division No. 1 requests that we furnish 13,000 foreign workers, I mean 13,000 foreign workers without the borders of the United States. When they present these figures to the Labor Branch, they are supposed to be the results of their survey of the available supply of intrastate workers; and that is, I think the workers you are referring to.

You asked the question, Do I believe that those eight or nine great States cannot supply interstate workers to meet their 13,000 worker deficit? This 13,000 is given to us as the need over and above their thinking and their belief in the available supply of interstate workers. They have asked us to produce 13,000 additional workers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Do you mean that those workers would be recruited from points other than continental United States?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir; unless between now and our recruitment time there are revised figures received from those States which would indicate either a further deficit or a more abundant supply of domestic labor.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Prior to the emergency created by the war, did those States import foreign labor during the peak seasons?

Mr. BUIE. I hardly think so. I don't believe that those States prior to the emergency caused by the war had access to foreign workers, except probably from Puerto Rico on the west coast.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Who brought them in?

Mr. BUIE. Those people are citizens. Anybody can bring them in. You can bring Puerto Ricans in now.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I know they are brought in, but who is doing the importing?

Mr. BUIE. If they were imported I suppose they were imported by associations.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, why can't the associations look after them now? Why call on the Government 2 years after the emergency to do a job that the associations did prior to the war?

Mr. BUIE. Well, I haven't the answer to that, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Don't you think it is about time that the associations find an answer to it?

Mr. BUIE. How is that?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Don't you think that they should step in and provide their own farm labor?

Mr. BUIE. I think that is the thing to do, and the tendency is to get rid of this foreign labor just as quickly as it possibly can be.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Do you think it is necessary to have a permanent program?

Mr. BUIE. Yes; I think there is some necessity for a permanent program which will direct domestic migratory labor.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All right. Why, then, didn't they formulate a permanent program and present it to the committee, rather than continue the program year after year? Why not face it once and for all and get rid of it, make a determination one way or the other?

Mr. BUIE. I would like, sir, if I may be permitted to do so, to state my position with regard to the data that I have. Now I think there is a representative in this room, who represents personally the Secretary of Agriculture, and he will give the thinking of the Secretary of Agriculture. My business here is entirely one from an operational function, and with full knowledge of how we operate the program as it is now covered by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Right there I think the Chair should say that he called Colonel Buie to tell us what data he had in regard to foreign labor. Mr. Overby will speak later for the Department.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We can develop the evidence. When they were before the committee last year it was stated, I think, by the representatives of the Department—I think the record will show that—that it was just a temporary measure, a stopgap, and during this stopgap period they would make a determination as to whether or not a permanent program was necessary. I understood that a permanent program was worked out, but something happened to it. I just can't put my fingers on what happened to it, and it was laid aside, and we are now requested to pass another stopgap piece of legislation.

Mr. BUIE. Well, sir, I am not familiar with what happened to it or what developed. In fact, I had no part in the development of it or the laying aside.

Mr. PACE. As long as the Federal Government will go to Puerto Rico and elsewhere and get these people and bring them in without cost to the producers, and then take those workers back, why, you and I and any producer would like that to continue forever.

Mr. BUIE. I don't think there is any question about it, Mr. Pace. As long as we can get something for nothing I think we are working for that type of thing.

Mr. PACE. But that is the thing before us.

Mr. BUIE. The picture that I am trying to present to you is one that is brought to us by the State extension services from all of the States in the Union, and they say they have surveyed the industries and the intrastate markets and they have found there is going to be a deficit this coming year; and as long as we have this central labor body in the Department of Agriculture, we mean to submit to you our figures, which we think are the final word up to the 1st of February, as to the available supply of labor that is in the country for the spring and fall agricultural work.

Mr. PACE. What is the total unemployment in the country today?

Mr. BUIE. What is the total unemployment in the country?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. BUIE. I have not any idea.

Mr. PACE. Don't you think that is essential to have, along with those other records? Don't you take into consideration the great number of unemployed in this country and the great number who are drawing unemployment compensation when you are considering the bringing in of foreign workers? Should not the unemployment situation be considered along with that?

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Pace, you say, "Don't you take into consideration?" I am still trying to bring out a point to you, that we do not make up these unemployment figures. That is left entirely up to the States to make it up. Your county agents are more familiar with your county than I am. I have no access to those figures, except by verbal or written request of those who tell me what is the surplus labor situation in your county.

Mr. PACE. We would not know the situation all over the Nation, but you, sitting here in Washington, should tell me what the national situation is.

Mr. BUIE. I think it is considerably less than it was expected because, as you recall, we expected some 8,000,000 to 10,000,000

unemployed in June and certainly our unemployment statistics would indicate that the fall and winter months are probably higher in regard to employment in industry than in the summer months; and I believe with something like 3,000,000 unemployed last June, I personally don't think it has increased much above that.

Mr. PACE. But you are still thinking that there are lots of vacant homes on the farm?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; peculiarly enough, there is a great shortage of houses on the farm.

Mr. PACE. Where are they?

Mr. BUIE. They may not be down in Georgia, sir; but I know that is one of the greatest problems that we face, namely the housing of the migratory workers' families.

Mr. PACE. Well certainly people have come out from the cities and gotten places in the country in which to live.

Mr. BUIE. I would not say there are many. There are a few, of course. We have migratory camps, labor camps throughout the country, that are handling agricultural needs as to housing of the migratory workers and interstate workers, and in some instances foreign workers. It is only in instances where there are available empty houses, not used by agricultural workers, that those houses are made available to some other people.

Mr. PACE. You would not have any people in them?

Mr. BUIE. No, I am talking about the houses we have.

Mr. POAGE. You are not the gentleman who can tell us about the operation of the program and how to handle it? If you are not, I do not want to take your time. I would like to know how you handle it.

Mr. BUIE. Being the Director, I do not know anybody who would be more qualified to tell you than I am.

Mr. POAGE. How would you handle it? By contract?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Poage, Colonel Buie was just giving figures showing the requests that have been received by the Department from the extension service in the various States. He has just given the figures on the northeast area, and I think we had better let him go ahead with his figures.

Mr. POAGE. I would be glad to let him proceed and then I want to ask him some questions before he leaves.

The CHAIRMAN. He started to put some figures in the record. I think he should proceed.

Mr. BUIE. I think I indicated that division 1 had a peak request in September of 13,550.

Division 2 comprises Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, and has a peak request in January, February, and March of 7,000.

Mr. PACE. What is Georgia?

Mr. BUIE. Georgia has the peak number in June and July of 500.

Mr. PACE. From whom did you get that data?

Mr. BUIE. From the State Extension Service.

Mr. PACE. You never have put a foreign worker in there.

Mr. BUIE. I think they picked your peaches with Bahamans, sir.

Mr. PACE. I am sure we never had any in Georgia.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. I don't think so.

Mr. BUIE. That is my recollection.

Mr. PACE I think that is one thing we never did.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. What have you done for Florida?

Mr. BUIE. We supplied last year Bahamans in Georgia, 382, and Jamaicans in Georgia 517, or a total of 899, from January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Mr. PACE. I apologize; that is new to me. I would certainly like to know where they were when I was down there because I never heard of them.

Mr. BUIE. Isn't it a fact that you have a peach county known as Winchester—no, that is Virginia apples. I have a lot of districts to think about. I even know the names of men. I recall one man that I hear about quite frequently.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Give me the figures on Virginia.

Mr. BUIE. On Virginia we have a request this year for 900 in September.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Where does that request come from?

Mr. BUIE. Where does that request come from?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. BUIE. It comes from the State emergency farm labor supervisor who represents the State director of extension.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Did they have any foreign farm labor in Virginia last year?

Mr. BUIE. Virginia had 1,156 Bahamans and 86 Jamaicans, or a total of 1,242 in Virginia last year.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Where did they go? I never heard of them.

Mr. BUIE. They were in the vegetable crops on the Eastern Shore and picking apples at Winchester in the fall of the year.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How many picked apples?

Mr. BUIE. I could not tell you.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Could you give me that break-down?

Mr. BUIE. That is a detail that comes out of the State extension office. I can eventually give it to you, sir, but I cannot give it to you right here.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Did you actually bring 1,156 foreigners in Virginia direct or reassemble them?

Mr. BUIE. The Labor Branch does not handle placements. We give you individuals. When we give you figures it does not represent placements because any one of those men might have been placed three or four or five times, and if we were working in terms of placements, the figure could be as high as 5,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You brought in 1,156?

Mr. BUIE. No, we brought in 1,242 foreign workers who went to work in Virginia, working in agriculture between January 1 and December 1, 1946. You are asking for 900 foreign workers this year.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Do you know who is making that request?

Mr. BUIE. Do you mean the individual growers?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes, I would like to know who they are.

Mr. BUIE. No, sir, I do not know. It comes to us from an over-all request from the Virginia State Extension Service.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That request comes from the Virginia State Extension Service?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All right.

Mr. PACE. How many is Georgia asking for this year?

Mr. BUIE. Georgia is asking for 500 in June and July.

Mr. PACE. I think that is high, probably, because we had a request for 10,000 from Mississippi and we offered them 500 and they did not take any.

I think we don't need them. To be perfectly frank with you, our people don't want them.

Mr. BUIE. I am not in a position to answer that question.

In division 3, which comprises the States of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin, they have a peak request of 15,675 in June, diminishing to 12,875 in August, and increasing to the same 15,675 again in September.

Mr. HOEVEN. Would you mind telling me about the request for Iowa?

Mr. BUIE. Iowa requests 900 Mexicans in the months of July and August.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do you know for what purpose?

Mr. BUIE. Sugarbeets.

Mr. HOEVEN. How many did they have last year?

Mr. BUIE. That is detasselling corn, too.

Mr. HOEVEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUIE. Last year in Iowa they had 771.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do those requests come to you from the extension service of the State?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir; these are indicated requests. They follow that up with certifications. Of course, the certifications are the final official word of the Labor Branch to supply labor. Those certifications are based on definite contracts that have been signed with the growers or growers' associations. The State extension service certifies this or the labor branch, on such and such a date that they will need so many Mexicans or Jamaicans. That is preliminary to the certification.

Mr. HOEVEN. These workers are all Mexicans?

Mr. BUIE. In the particular case of Iowa there are 900 Mexicans requested. They had Jamaicans and Mexicans—I gave you the wrong figure. I was reading Indiana. I have a higher figure to give you—53 Jamaicans and 1,717 Mexicans, or a total of 1,750 foreign workers in Iowa from January 1 to December 31, 1946. That number has been reduced to 900 as a maximum; in other words about cut in half.

Mr. HILL. I think we are about to get the wrong impression on this. What you are talking about, if I get it right, is that you are talking about men who come in the community to do a piece of work or handle a crop, whatever it happens to be, and in a few days they are gone. As I gather from the gentleman's remarks, those foreign workers pick the peaches in Georgia and were gone before the gentleman from Georgia was aware that they were there.

Mr. BUIE. That is right. These men stay as few as 10 days. That is why we don't use placements in our figures or we would have astronomical figures almost, if we started dealing with placements, because that same Mexican can spend a couple of days detasselling corn. He finishes that job; which is historically a short one, and he moves into another area of needs. I may say some of these Mexicans may serve 50 or 100 contractors, that is growers, grower associations, during the harvest season.

Mr. HILL. How will you put a value on the work of a few men who come into a community, save the crop, and move on? Who is going to say whether a few dollars spent on a thing like that is money wasted? That is the question I am asking the gentleman from Georgia. They might put the Governors to work but they haven't enough yet to pick the peach crop. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Hill, I think your point is very well taken, because here we worked 22,000 Mexicans in the great sugar-beet harvest this past fall. In other words 22,000 Mexicans harvested 35 percent of the sugar beets, representing approximately \$130,000,000.

Mr. HILL. I would like to say this for the edification and enlightenment of the committee, that in our own State we have a group of, let us say, Mexican, Spanish Americans, or whatever you wish to call them, who come up in our territory to work in the beet fields; but let us see what happens. Here is a group of Spanish Americans or Mexicans that are up in our territory. Some man close by has a number of acres of green beans and they must be picked in a certain short period of time. The Mexican laborers are used in harvesting this man's crop. The same thing maintains on tomatoes and many other type of vegetables.

In our territory it would be absolutely impossible to recruit labor from Baltimore or from Kansas City or from any other city that you wish to mention, and bring them in in time and organize them so that they could harvest the crop. What we have to know before we put the beans in is, are we going to have the pickers. We must know before we put the tomatoes in whether we can pick them, and before we can plant the beets we must know whether we will have labor to take care of them.

Mr. GATHINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. I wish to say that the gentleman who has just spoken is a member of the committee studying food.

Mr. HILL. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. And one of the main problems before the committee is the shortage, not only of farm equipment, but of obtaining labor to harvest the sugar-beet crop.

Mr. HILL. And I say to the gentleman from Arkansas, the important thing is that the labor must be there without delay. I am speaking from experience. We are a long, long ways from the labor market of some of the eastern cities. Now our peaches must be harvested in a short period of time, a matter of days, almost hours sometime. How in the world are you going to recruit labor if you do not have an organization such as the one we now have on the job?

Mr. GATHINGS. In my country we have peaches, rice, and cotton, and they have to be gotten out when the weather is good. If you do not pick the cotton at the right time you do not get white cotton. All through this runs the idea we are mixing up our foreign labor with migratory labor in the United States.

If you don't have some type of organization to recruit adequate labor I can see where you will lose thousands of acres of crops, and you will not only lose them, but you will not prevail on the farmers to plant them.

Mr. POAGE. What was done before the Government undertook to do everything for the farmers?

Mr. HILL. I will be glad to answer the question. Before the Government put its nose in everybody's business and got in everybody's hair like bees, these fellows could go out and recruit their own labor, without regulations. Now it is impossible for any individual or organization to recruit their own labor. It is even impossible for a great company like our Great Western Sugar Co. You make it impossible for a farmer to recruit even migratory labor. Now we have passed that stage and there is no use in talking about what the farmer did or did not do in the past. We used to milk cows, getting up at 4 o'clock in the morning. There is no use to talk about that now because we are using milking machines. Then officials stepped in and said: "If you are going to milk cows, you are going to have to build a proper barn and equipment, and treat that milk so that it comes up to certain standards of sanitation."

Just a few minutes ago we passed a bill because the gentlemen from California said: "You cannot dump your garbage any more along the California coast." They said they needed help from the Federal Government to stop coastal vessels dumping garbage along the California coast.

I am not the one to say different. These farmers must have this migratory labor organization that they can appeal to and bring these laborers in.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question there.

Does the gentleman mean that the United States Employment Service, plus the State employment services, are a complete answer at this time?

Mr. HILL. The witness's testimony convinced me, which I knew before the testimony was given, that after all, the only organization that really reaches the farmer himself as an individual is the county agricultural extension leaders. The county agricultural agent is the only expert I know of who can tell this organization within a day or so when peaches must be harvested. Am I not right, that he can tell within a day or two that the peaches must be harvested? They will tell you to a day when to pick your beans and when to pick the tomatoes. The county agents are the ones who can tell you when the crops are ready, and all they are waiting for is this organization that Colonel Buie represents to say that the help will be provided.

Mr. PACE. Do you mean the Extension Service would be prohibited from making a report?

The CHAIRMAN. Why can't we discuss this in executive session?

Mr. HILL. If you take it away from the Extension Service—

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). Mr. Simpson has a question.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Buie, what is the figure for Illinois in 1946?

Mr. BUIE. Illinois had in the year 1946, 1,119 Jamaicans, 1,555 Mexicans, and 7 Barbadoans, or a total of 2,681 used in the past year.

Illinois has asked this year that we supply them with a peak of 800 Mexicans in June and 900 West Indians in June, diminishing in July, increasing in August, back to that figure of 800 Mexicans in August and September, and 900 West Indians in August and September. That would indicate a total this year asked for 1,700 combined Mexicans and West Indians.

Mr. SIMPSON. What part of Mexico are these Mexicans recruited from?

Mr. BUIE. They are recruited in the rural districts of Mexico. We did have the year before last a restriction placed on us by the Mexican

Government that the recruitment would be done in the Federal District. We spent considerable time in Mexico City with the Mexican Government last year, and finally got them to agree that we need not get them in the Federal District but that they would be rural workers.

Mr. SIMPSON. What is there to keep these Mexicans coming to Illinois or Iowa in August from bringing in foot-and-mouth disease in their clothing and shoes?

Mr. BUIE. That question, sir, is very much under consideration with us. The chief of our Medical Section, or the chief of the Medical Branch which works with the Labor Branch, is a Public Health Service doctor. We are cognizant of the fact that the disease is there, and I am sure proper precautions will be taken and we will be guided and restricted by whatever the Bureau of Animal Husbandry, or whatever agency handles that, decides. We will be regulated by their quarantines that they may see fit to set.

Mr. SIMPSON. Then as far as Illinois is concerned or any other Mid-West State, proper precautions will be taken to prevent the entry of that disease? Illinois had to slaughter more herds than any State in the Union during the 1914 foot-and-mouth disease epidemic. We certainly feel quite strongly that we would want to know definitely where the Mexicans come from. I doubt if Illinois would want them under the prevailing circumstances.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir; I appreciate the seriousness of the foot-and-mouth disease, but I can assure you that the precautions taken will be in keeping with the interest of prevention of the entry of that disease.

Mr. SIMPSON. I understand there are 10 States in Mexico having foot-and-mouth disease, according to the reports which have come before the subcommittee.

Mr. BUIE. They have some States which are free, and I think they are mostly in the south sections of Mexico.

Mr. GROSS. Will you give me some figures on the foreign labor introduced into Pennsylvania?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir. Last year Pennsylvania had 392 Bahamans, 126 Barbadoans, and 523 Jamaicans, making a total of 1,041 for the period January 1 to December 31, 1946.

Mr. GROSS. What have they asked for this year?

Mr. BUIE. They have asked for this year a total of 600 West Indians, August, September, and October. They start at 350 in April and build up to 600 and down to 400 in November; but the peak season, August, September, and October, we have a request for 600.

Mr. GROSS. Can you tell me whether the requests come in as to where these workers come from? I have noticed you have indicated where they come from.

Mr. BUIE. They do not indicate where they should come from. We should not tie them down to that. We say West Indians because it is impracticable and uneconomical in some instances and we have to vary these placements, but the policy is to use all West Indians to serve the eastern seaboard because they are nearest to their point of recruitment; and another thing, it is historically true that the Mexican and the Latin American has served the Middle West and the far West States, and there are many Latin, Spanish-speaking people, in those States who understand them; and it makes it of greater advantage to the farmer to have people who understand their customs; whereas we here in the East are familiar with the colored people's.

Mr. GROSS. I received a telegram from a party in Texas calling my attention to the proposed new wire fence built on the boundary to keep out foot-and-mouth disease. What do you know about that? Why should the Department of Agriculture build a wire fence along the border?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. GROSS. Will you tell me how many people attended the Salt Lake City meeting?

Mr. BUIE. We have an average of about one hundred.

Mr. GROSS. And how many attended the Chicago meeting?

Mr. BUIE. The same number came there and the same number attended Atlantic City. Actually, at Atlantic City they had 92, but my average was one hundred at each convention. There were representatives present from each State.

Mr. GROSS. I know of some fellows who attended those meetings and I understand there has been a good bit of criticism of the travel obligations of the Department of Agriculture, and I wonder how many representatives you had at the Chicago and Atlantic City meeting.

Mr. BUIE. We had about one hundred.

Mr. GROSS. Did you have regional meetings of supervisors of regional officers in Atlanta about a week ago?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir, not our Labor Branch of the Production and Marketing Division. We do not have regions. Regional meetings are not a part of our labor plans.

Mr. GROSS. That is about all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gillie would like to ask a question.

Mr. GROSS. You say there will be 600 foreign laborers in Pennsylvania in 1947.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And at that time we will have 60,000 unemployed getting \$20 or better a week, and some of them will be right in my Congressional District?

Mr. GILLIE. Colonel Buie, getting back to this labor problem of bringing Mexicans in from Mexico, I think we have to be very careful. According to press reports the foot-and-mouth disease has broken out in northern Mexico. I recently read a story in regard to an English soldier in Germany who visited one of the farms in Germany and carried that disease back to England onto the farm of his father. The result was that they lost their entire herd of cattle. That shows how very infectious this disease is. I think something will have to be done to stop, or at least to screen very carefully, labor that comes in from Mexico.

This disease infestation is very bad in Mexico and something will have to be done shortly. That is being worked out now. In the meantime I do not see how you can bring laborers in from Mexico or from anywhere near the infected areas and call them safe in this country.

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Gillie, I am sure we will be directed properly in that movement by the proper controls, as our people see it.

I might indicate to you, sir, that the Mexican Government realizes the situation in regard to the foot-and-mouth disease and does not permit us to recruit along the border. That has always been a problem, of encouraging the unemployed to congregate on the border, which would tend to increase in great numbers the "wet backs."

Mr. GILLIE. If you are not allowed to recruit along the border, you will not be able to bring any in; because south of the border is where the disease is.

Mr. BUIE. Our people know of three States where there is no record of the disease, and I presume those States will be designated and I presume that there will be certain strict requirements. We have a pretty rigid Health Inspection Section against communicable diseases which a man can communicate, one to another. Whether or not they are working out some procedure for us to follow in connection with the foot-and-mouth disease, it has not come definitely to us but we are proceeding along the lines that it will be taken care of.

Mr. GILLIE. I certainly want the Bureau of Animal Industry to designate where they should come from, because in 1929 in California this virus lived for 365 days after the quarantine was lifted. So you can see how terribly infectious it is.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, I do; I realize it.

Mr. PACE. I think it is rather fantastic, but they said that the authorities are concerned about airplanes coming in from Mexico, because the disease was so highly infectious. It strikes me as going to an extreme.

Mr. BUIE. I went through that situation and I know what a terrible thing it is. It is terrible and it must be guarded against.

Mr. GRANGER. I think it should be said on the record that in regard to the border, on both sides of the border there are 1,000 miles of cattle, to prevent the inter-mingling of these cattle is the reason for the fence.

Mr. GROSS. Well the telegram I had said it was because of the foot-and-mouth disease. I thought it was ridiculous.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed, Colonel.

Mr. BUIE. I think the last I gave you was division 3.

The next division is division 4, which is comprised of Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

Mr. GRANGER. Would you mind giving me the figures for Utah?

Mr. BUIE. Do you want the figures for this year or last year?

Mr. GRANGER. What they used last year.

Mr. BUIE. Utah used last year 1,673 Mexicans.

Mr. GRANGER. This is an interesting thing I have here, a circular of the unemployment. During that whole year from July 1945, they had 212 people on the unemployment roll, and in July 1946, they had 11,485; and every one of those months it was in about the same proportion, and I wish you would compare 1945 with 1946 in that there was just about 10 times as much employment in 1946 as in 1945. It is very likely that the same proportion of unemployment would prevail next year.

Mr. BUIE. Utah has asked for this year, 1,800 Mexicans for May, June, July, September, and October.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a statement here in connection with these requests.

The Labor Branch never furnishes the number. The States first review the situation. You understand then we review their figures. We screen and if we in the final total have furnished 50 percent of the original requests, we think we have done a good job.

Now I would like to explain why that happens. Now when these requests come in, division 1 does not know how many men can be shifted from division 2, or division 4 does not know how many men can be shifted from division 1. It is our planning job to find how many places we can use an individual so that we can actually reduce these figures. As a matter of fact, the present Appropriations Committee only permits us to import 25,000 workers this spring, and when we have requests here for 90,000, you can see that we have got to do the job by making these men as elastic as possible, moving them from one State to another, using the trucking association which may have anywhere from 25 to 50 farmer members. In that way the men are utilized to the greatest advantage and that is why so much work is accomplished with a few men.

Mr. HILL. Will you break down your figures for Colorado?

Mr. BUIE. Do you mean those of last year?

Mr. HILL. Yes, and what they need for 1947.

Mr. BUIE. In 1946 Colorado used 150 Barbadoans, 203 Jamaicans, and 2,723 Mexicans, or a total of 3,076.

Mr. HILL. Now this is all foreign labor you are talking about?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir. I am not talking about intrastate or interstate labor at all.

Mr. HILL. Can you tell us how many interstate you supplied?

Mr. BUIE. We supplied none, sir, that is, through the Federal and State extension services. That does not come under our services.

Mr. HILL. How does the Extension Service become aware of the places where they are going to be able to secure these men?

Mr. BUIE. By contacts. For instance, I might give you an exact example. The State farm labor supervisor of Colorado goes to Alabama. I know that historically. They recruit in Alabama, for instance, or Mississippi, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Texas; and he confers with the authorities in the State extension service in these various States and he gets their calculations of what they think then can supply.

Mr. HILL. In other words he cannot get any men out of any State unless the labor organization in that State approves?

Mr. BUIE. That is right; the head of the labor organization in the respective State certifies that the labor is surplus and available. For instance, you have mentioned the Great Western Sugar Corp. Assuming they have 250,000 acres of beets and the figures we have been given show that it takes 1 man for every 10 acres of beets: Well, you will require 25,000 workers to take care of that many acres of beets. You certainly cannot find that many workers in intrastate available or within the adjoining county. However, you make a survey and find all available manpower you can get; then you see from out of the State what interstate workers you can get; and then you sum that up and subtract that from the total requirements, and that is the figure that comes to us to supply foreign workers.

Mr. HILL. Do you think any other organization could supply those figures without putting in a whole organization?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know of anybody unless they run a duplication along with the county agents.

Mr. HILL. How many is Colorado calling for in 1947?

Mr. BUIE. Colorado is calling for a total of 5,000 foreign workers.

Mr. GATHINGS. Could you state for the record what those workers would do and what crops they would be used in?

Mr. BUIE. In Colorado?

Mr. GATHINGS. Yes; I think it would be very helpful to the committee to know that.

Mr. BUIE. The peach crops, of course, would be the first, I presume; or rather, first, I think, would be the demand for the beets. Next would be the tree crops, preparing these, and last is the big harvest of the sugar beets.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Can you give me a break-down of the foreign labor in Minnesota, where we have the canning and growing of vegetables? I would like to have it for this year and last year.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir, Mr. Andresen; I can give you that.

Minnesota, from January 1 to December 31, 1946, had 100 Bahamans, 707 Jamaicans, and 3,583 Mexicans, or a total of 3,490.

This year they have asked for 3,000 Mexicans and 500 West Indians, or a total of 3,500 that you are asking for this year.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Do you have the figures broken down for the next year, as to whether they are for canning or other industries or sugar beets or different fruits and vegetables?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir, Mr. Andresen; and I will tell you why we don't have that figure; The Labor Branch of the Production and Marketing Administration of the Department of Agriculture recruits these foreign workers, transports them, provides housing where necessary, attends to their medical care; but when they are turned over to the State extension services, we lose then their identity at the actual point where they are working on the crops.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Isn't it a fact that in negotiating for the number that is necessary, the different industries come and confer with you and say how many will be needed for the various lines of work, and then that is broken down into States?

Mr. BUIE. Yes; we do that. Industries confer with us, indicating what their needs are going to be, but we have no final figures saying actually where those men worked and what fields they worked in. We know how many were employed, however, but we do not know the detail as to where each man worked all the time. Those men are moved from one farm operation to another, and we do not know any more than that they are working. I think that figure possibly can be obtained through the Extension Service and Mr. M. C. Wilson, who I think is present in the room at this time, I think he can give you some light on that.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Have you any statement as to the effect on our food production of the different products if this labor is not made available for 1947?

Mr. BUIE. We have many telegrams indicating the necessity for the continuation of this program from groups all over the country.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Have you anything definite in regard to the percentage of the production of fruits and vegetables that would be affected if this labor were not made available?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; not in this presentation; I have not that information.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Do you know whether the Extension Service might have that information available?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know whether the Extension Service has. Possibly the branches affected by it, as for example the Fruit and Vegetable Branch. Mr. Wilson is here and I would suggest that you ask him if he has that information available.

Mr. WILSON. It is possible that our Fruit and Vegetable Branch may have some information, and I think there are representatives from some of those industries here who might make some information available.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I hope someone will give that information. It should be made available to the committee because it is important that we get the food.

Just another question. Is there any regulation from your office or from the Extension Service which might require your office or the Extension Service to report to the unemployment compensation commissions if you wanted domestic labor or foreign labor? Now I know that there are many persons in this country who are drawing unemployment compensation who could do this work but who are not very anxious to take it, as long as they can get their unemployment compensation. Now do you think that the unemployment compensation program has any effect on this situation?

Mr. BUIE. This is an entirely personal reflection, sir. I think that there is naturally some effect. It is easier to earn \$20 a week doing nothing than earn \$40 a week working hard, and I cannot help but say there must be some effect of it. What the extent of it is I am not able to say.

Mr. BUIE. I think there are a great number of our own people who are definitely reluctant, and I think that is putting it very mild, to accept stoop labor on the farm as a livelihood.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Of course, the farmers cannot pay \$20 a week during normal times. That is pretty high.

Mr. BUIE. If someone would raise it to \$25 a week, I think it would be very profitable.

Mr. ANDRESEN. I am sure your very able brother who is a doctor would recommend that kind of work for a good many of us, to hold down the waist line.

Mr. BUIE. That is right; it would help me.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. BUIE. I think I have covered division 4, and now I will turn to division 5.

Mr. GATHINGS. I think you did not give us the figures on division 4.

Mr. BUIE. Division 4 has asked for a total of 19,950 in the month of June. That is the high point. That is reduced to 5,700 in August, and jumps back up to 18,900 in October.

Division 5 is composed of Arizona, California, Nevada, and New Mexico. That group of four States has asked for a high of 38,400 in October.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Can you tell me how many unemployed there were in that group of States?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Are there any unemployed in that group of States.

Mr. BUIE. I have no record of that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Could you get us the figures of the unemployment in those States at that time?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know whether the United States Employment Service has that figure or not. We don't have it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You would not want to put in that there were unemployed people not working?

Mr. BUIE. We don't do it, sir, because our placement, our shipping of these people, is based on the certifications of the State extension

services that there are no people available for this work in the vicinity in which they have asked for them, that they have been unable to recruit the necessary individuals to do this job.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Before anything is done, don't you think that you should have an actual break-down of the unemployment in each State?

Mr. BUIE. The unemployed do not always represent a figure of those who will go to work.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I know that, but we certainly have not reached the point where we will have unemployment in industry and then go out and spend money to bring people in to work, when there are people who want to labor.

Mr. BUIE. I think you find, sir, in the eastern half of this country, that that situation is very prevalent.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Then shouldn't we reverse our processes and try to get people to go to work, spend the money in that direction rather than spending money transporting these people here. Why run ears across the continent and take them in airplanes and set up places for them to live, provide doctors and hospitals and all that, at the expense of all the people, when there are any number of people on unemployment rolls who are not getting enough money to live on?

Mr. GRANGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes.

Mr. GRANGER. In my State here they had 1,700 foreign employees in July, and yet they had 11,485 on the unemployment rolls. In August they had 9,000; September, 8,000; October, 6,000; November, 5,000; a total of \$5,800,000 in unemployment compensation.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Now, shouldn't we get these people working who are on the unemployment rolls? Here we have people on the unemployment rolls drawing compensation, and in face of all that we are spending this money. How many millions?

Mr. GRANGER. \$6,000,000 in my State.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How much are you spending in California and Arizona?

Mr. BUIE. I don't have the figures on that.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It seems to me, Colonel, you have got a pretty good staff. How many people have you working for you, approximately?

Mr. BUIE. We have a total of 44 in Washington and a total in the entire country of 959 full-time employees.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is nearly 1,000. Now I think with that group you should be able to get the information pretty quickly.

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; I don't think you should get it pretty quickly. Even take our staff, if you allow 10 acres to a man, we could handle 10,000 acres; that is, if they are all fit for it, but I know I could not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. This committee has no jurisdiction over unemployment legislation. If we had we certainly would make some changes. Unfortunately we do not have jurisdiction.

Mr. POAGE. You are right about that.

Mr. PACE. I am assuming somewhere along the line you will have to make some concessions to unemployment. It isn't clear to me and I do not know that you can clear it. I do know somewhere the State employment services and the United States Employment

Service get together, and I would like to know why there is absolutely no coordination between your office and those offices.

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Pace, I cannot answer that question. I would rather that question be referred to either a member of the United States Employment Service or the representative here of the Federal Extension Service, Mr. M. P. Wilson, who as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Extension Service has all the strings of these many thousands of county agents and State directors of extension. I think he can give you a much more intelligent answer than I can.

Mr. PACE. As I understand, the extension services of the States are also coordinating with the United States Unemployment Service, which has extension services in every State in the Union. It isn't clear to me why it is that there is no practical cooperation between them? Can you tell us who might know? There should be coordination and then maybe we can find the answer to the problem. It does not strike me, Colonel, as fundamental that my Government and your Government should pay out millions and millions of dollars to millions of unemployed people and then consider an appropriation to bring in people from foreign countries to work.

Now fundamentally I don't like it. If the beet crop is going to be lost for lack of labor, I am willing to help it. If my peach crop is going to be lost, I am willing to help save it. But it seems to me there is a way to help them better than bringing in people from foreign countries. Is that clear?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; I think you are thinking of a permanent program. I mean, as I gather from your statement, there should be some method worked out, some plan, some scheme.

Mr. PACE. Why not do it now? Why wait another year?

Mr. BUIE. Well, the thinking of those who have handled this program is that it cannot be done in the time remaining between now and the cultivation time period. The people who are planting their crops want the guaranty that they will get the labor.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of Colonel Buie and the committee to the fact that in last night's Evening Star you have column after column, "Help, Men," "Help, Men," "Help, Women," "Help, Women." You have column after column in Washington papers where they are crying for labor, and it is not Colonel Buie's problem nor is it the problem of those handling unemployment compensation. Colonel Buie is bringing us the figures from the various sections where they want this labor for a particular period during the year.

There are very few asking for work in this paper and I want to say also, the people feel the same way down in my country, where they are crying for men and women to work.

Our problem is to work out some educational program, it seems to me, to urge these folks to go to work and not accept unemployment insurance. I am against paying unemployment compensation to able-bodied men when the farmer needs labor to plant and harvest his crop. I am in favor of the bill of the gentleman from Georgia to limit immigration in this country. These Mexicans come in, harvest the crop, and go right back. They do not stay.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Chair should say, in view of some of the questions asked Colonel Buie, that as far as the Chair knows the Department of Agriculture is not asking for any extension of this

legislation. The only people that I know are asking for it are the people in the local communities, the canning companies, and others who are unable to get sufficient labor to go ahead to produce the food crops that we need in this country.

We have not received a report from the Department in which they are asking for any extension of this legislation. The requests are coming from the growers and producers of agricultural products.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that the colonel has a number of telegrams that he has received from growers and employers of labor that have come to their regional offices. However, I would like to know whether any telegrams have been received from any of the Department employees or from the Department itself.

Mr. BUIE. No, sir.

Mr. GROSS. We have lots of evidence here where there are demands for the continuation of a program which have come from within the Government itself, an abundance of proof of that.

It might be well to put some of the telegrams from the growers in the record so that we would know where they come from.

Mr. BUIE. We would be glad to do that, sir, but I am not referring to people working for the Government. I am referring to growers and processors.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, you may insert such letters at the end of the hearing.

(The following letters were submitted by Colonel Buie:)

THE IOWA-NEBRASKA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER,
Audubon, Iowa, February 1, 1947.

HON. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following telegram was sent to you and all members of the Iowa congressional delegation by Association President Asher and the writer, on behalf of all Iowa-Nebraska canners.

[Copy of telegram]

"Iowa-Nebraska canners, operators of 52 canning plants annually harvesting and processing 70,000 acres of vegetable crops, unanimously recommend the passage of House Resolution 229 and the appropriation of funds providing for a continuation of the Department of Agriculture's foreign labor program through 1947. Many seasonal workers are required for harvesting canning crops while such crops are in prime condition and in many localities the supply of local labor is inadequate. Canners must therefore be assured they will have the help of Mexican or other nationals to prevent serious reduction of vegetable crop acreage in 1947 and thereby impose a definite hardship on growers of canning crops and the consuming public."

This organization is composed of all canners operating processing plants in the States of Iowa and Nebraska. At the present time, there are only three canning plants in Nebraska. Two of these plants are located in Missouri River towns and over 90 percent of the corn, peas, beans, tomatoes, pumpkin and asparagus processed by them is grown on the Iowa side of the river.

Under normal conditions, cannery labor, for both farm and factory operations, is recruited from cannery towns and neighboring localities. However, during the last few years, it has been impossible to obtain enough employees for field work from this source, and canners have been forced to rely on foreign labor. For awhile prisoners of war answered this purpose. In 1946, under the Department of Agriculture's foreign labor program, several hundred Mexican and other nationals were used. These workers undoubtedly saved thousands of dollars worth of valuable food crops for the farmers and for the use of the consuming public.

Looking ahead to the harvesting season of 1947, canners see no prospect on any material change in the field labor situation. The average American worker simply does not care to, and will not do farm work as long as other forms of employment are available. Therefore, it is the considered opinion of Iowa-Nebraska vegetable canners that:

(1) If they are to contract with growers of canning crops for sufficient acreage to produce normal peacetime packs, they must be assured of an adequate labor supply to harvest the crop.

(2) The Department of Agriculture's foreign labor program, as conducted in 1946, is a proven method of obtaining such workers.

Therefore, we trust you will give this matter your best attention and support when considering legislation, providing for a continuance of the departmental program through 1947.

Yours very truly,

IOWA-NEBRASKA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
ROY CHARD, *Secretary*.

[Telegram]

MARSHALLTOWN, IOWA, *January 29, 1947.*

Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture:

We are reliably informed that Representative Hope of Kansas has presented a resolution extending Public Law 229 for a year from June 30, 1947. Canners of Iowa are heartily in favor of the extension for, unless we have Mexican labor to pick corn, it will be almost impossible to get farmers to contract for acreage. Our company alone has applied for 400 Mexicans. Canners also feel that farm labor should remain with your Department and not transferred to Labor. Iowa canners will appreciate your support of this program.

MARSHALL CANNING CO.
GUY E. POLLOCK.

AGRICULTURE FARM LABOR PROGRAM

(Copy of resolutions passed by the Wisconsin Canner's Association in their meeting in November, and the Iowa-Nebraska Canners in December)

WISCONSIN

Whereas local agricultural labor has continued in short supply throughout 1946 and it appears that such shortage will continue beyond the period of the war emergency, and

Whereas the Emergency Farm Labor Program administered by the United States Department of Agriculture and the Agricultural Extension Service has met the labor needs of the growers of canning crops during the war years in a satisfactory and efficient manner; be it

Resolved, That this association urge the Federal Government to continue a migratory and foreign farm labor program so long as shortages of such labor continue, on the same basis and through the same agencies as the emergency farm labor program.

IOWA

Be it further resolved, That local agricultural labor has continued in short supply throughout 1946, and we recommend that this association urge the Federal Government to continue a migratory and foreign labor program, so long as shortages of such labor continue on the same basis and through the same agencies as the emergency farm labor program.

* * * * *

MERLAU TRUCKING SERVICE,
New Palestine, Ind., January 20, 1947.

Representative RAYMOND S. SPRINGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Last week I was informed by our local cannery that it was doubtful if I would be able to obtain Mexican nationals for my farm labor the coming season. If I am unable to obtain this labor it will be a great handicap to me.

I am in great need of help beginning May 1 to October 31 for my crops of peas, lima beans, and tomatoes. I will have 200 acres of the above crops besides 300 acres of other crops.

Whatever you are able to do to obtain these laborers will be greatly appreciated by me.

Yours truly,

ELMER MERLAU, *New Palestine.*

STOKELY FOODS, INC.,
Indianapolis 7, Ind., January 16, 1947.

HON. HOMER FERGUSON,
United States Senate, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: Last spring, the W. R. Roach Co. was merged with Stokely-Van Camp, Inc., of Indianapolis, Ind., including our factories at Hart, Scottville, Owosso and Croswell, Mich., and, therefore, I am writing you not only as pertains to our own position here in Michigan, but also as pertains to the entire Stokely organization, having plants in many States in the Middle West, on this migratory labor problem in the operation of our plants during the canning season.

During 1946 our plants could not get sufficient local labor in order to harvest our seasonal crops, and it was necessary for us to use imported agricultural labor. We believe many thousands of acres of canning crops could not have been harvested during the past year, and it is the unanimous opinion of all of our plant managers and farmers who grow for us that the supply of workers needed to conduct seasonal field operations in all of our respective areas will continue to fall far short of requirements as long as can be reasonably foreseen. In view of these circumstances, it is necessary and vital that all of us try to have this program extended relative to importing foreign agricultural workers and recruiting such domestic agricultural workers as are available in labor surplus areas within this country for employment in areas where there will exist a shortage.

Public Law 226 provides for the recruiting and transporting of foreign workers for agriculture. The last Congress extended this law to June 30, 1947. This means that all Mexican nationals, Jamaicans and Barbadians will be out of this country by June 30 of this year. The majority of the canning crops will all be harvested after June 30. Consequently, this program will not do any of us cannerymen a great deal of good.

We believe that the present labor branch of the United States Department of Labor should be continued as an active service organization for the procurement of domestic labor from surplus areas, and also to act in like capacity for the procurement of foreign labor.

We feel that the present law should be extended to December 31, 1947, which law, if in force, would mean that the same number of imported workers would be available for the entire 1947 packing season.

We are writing you at this time because we feel that immediate action should be taken in order to assure the growers of seasonal crops of this labor, and trust that you will support the continuation of this program. Should you want any additional information relative to this, we remain,

Very truly yours,

STOKELY FOODS, INC.,
F. M. ROBERTS,
District Manager.

MINNESOTA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
Minneapolis, Minn., December 30, 1946.

MR. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
*Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Congress, as you know, before their adjournment this past summer, extended the farm labor supply program, Public Law 229, as amended, from December 31, 1946, to June 30, 1947, primarily for the purpose of permitting the importation of national labor from Mexico, Jamaica, and other islands to assist in the 1946 crop production. You will be interested in knowing, we are sure, that without this imported national labor and prisoners of war at the time they were used, it would have been quite impossible to grow and harvest the

quantities of foodstuffs which were produced during the war years and including the 1946 season.

As an illustration, in Minnesota alone in 1946, 90 percent of the sweet corn, 70 percent of the peas, and 90 percent of the other canning crops were harvested by this imported labor. You will be interested in knowing, too, we believe, that Minnesota in 1946 was the largest producer of canned sweet corn, having packed almost 20 percent of the total supply available in the United States; their pea production was third in the Nation's volume.

At the peak in 1946 approximately 2,500 foreign nationals were used in Minnesota. This number varied from approximately 2,000 in June and July, to 2,500 in August and September. Some, of course, were used in May for the harvesting of asparagus.

In attempting to determine what the labor needs are going to be for the crop year of 1947, a recent careful survey has been made of each of the canning districts in Minnesota as to the return of labor, such as veterans and other labor which had migrated to war and ordnance plants, as well as the usual local labor supply, with the result that estimates now point toward a very definite need of between 2,000 and 2,500 imported laborers during the period June 15 to October 1 for the harvesting of canned foods alone. This estimate does not include the requirements of the sugar beet people, whose acreage, as you know, is being increased this year, or of other agricultural users such as truck gardeners, etc.

You are familiar, too, we believe, with the fact that this imported labor has been made available through the United States Department of Agriculture, Labor Branch, who negotiated contracts with the Mexican Government and with Great Britain on Jamaicans, Bahamans, etc., and who further recruited these workers, transported them to the United States and to point of usage, dividing them among the various districts where the need was greatest. At no time did any of these imported laborers displace local or domestic labor, as each placement of this national labor was accomplished only after the United States Employment Service and the Minnesota State Extension Service, through its county agents, certified that efforts of recruitment had failed to secure necessary domestic labor for the harvesting and processing of these food crops.

Early in the session of the new Congress it is planned to present a program for the continuation of this farm labor, based primarily on the estimated needs of the 1947 pack year as outlined above. This program is designed to continue in streamlined form the present Labor Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, inasmuch as they are most closely connected with the agricultural needs and are also experienced and versed in the movement of labor to districts where it is needed, such labor to be used, of course, only in such districts where actual need exists. This program intends to make full use of domestic labor, routing such from points of oversupply to points of undersupply, and, secondly, to permit the importation of nationals from Mexico, Jamaica, and the like, when the domestic supply of labor is not sufficient.

The canning industry is entirely seasonal industry, dealing with perishable products which must be handled as they approach the proper maturity, or otherwise become lost. Hence, it follows that labor needs are seasonal, reaching peak during the harvesting months when all other branches of agriculture also are in full harvest. It should be said here that the use of imported labor is largely to the advantage of the farmer, not only in his production of crops for canneries, but as well in the growing and harvesting of other food and feed crops. This program is essential to the entire economy of the country, for unless necessary labor can be assured, production plans will need to be reduced in line with limited local labor supply, resulting in increased costs, higher prices, and further inflation.

It is the sincere belief of our industry that if a full production is again to be realized in 1947, nature permitting, imported labor will be an essential requirement to accomplish this aim.

We hope this information brief of the labor situation as it affects agricultural communities will be helpful to you in your favorable consideration of the farm labor program to be presented to the new Congress.

Yours very truly,

MINNESOTA CANNERS ASSOCIATION,
ROBERT L. WILSON, *Secretary*.

INDIANA CANNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Indianapolis 4, Ind., January 2, 1947.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Our Congress, during their last session, extended the farm labor supply program, Public Law 229, as amended, to June 30, 1947. This law, as you know, provided for the importation of foreign workers, nationals from Mexico, Jamaica, Barbadoes, and other islands for the purpose of growing and harvesting agricultural crops.

We believe that employment conditions in the State of Indiana during the current year will be as critical as in the past. Predictions by experts are that employment will be up in Indiana in 1947 rather than downward. A large number of foreign nationals were utilized during the past few years in the production of agricultural products, and it is believed that without them our production would have been greatly curtailed. We believe it just as important that they be available again during the year of 1947.

Indiana is one of the major States packing, or canning, fresh vegetables. Our total acreage for tomatoes, corn, peas, lima beans, pumpkin, and other miscellaneous crops amounts to some 175,000 acres; our total pack from this acreage, approximately 16,000,000 cases. In view of our large production of essential foods, and since we believe that the labor supply will again be critical during the current year, we urge that you give serious consideration to a further extension of the farm labor supply program, Public Law 229, as amended, to continue through the year 1947.

Very truly yours,

INDIANA CANNERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
A. F. DREYER, *Secretary.*

[Western Union]

VINTON, IOWA, January 29, 1947.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

We feel that interests of agriculture are best served within Department of Agriculture and vigorously protest transfer of agricultural labor to office of Secretary of Labor.

IOWA CANNING Co.

FUHREMANN CANNING Co.,
Lanark, Ill., December 30, 1946.

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BROOKS. During the years 1944 to 1946, inclusive, the United States Department of Agriculture has helped us out by furnishing foreign laborers to take care of our production of peas and corn due to the help shortage during these times. As we understand Congress has appropriated sufficient funds for this service up to the 1st of June 1947. We are therefore writing and asking for your support to continue this work further than June 1. If this service should end on the 1st of June, it would greatly handicap our industry. We have already made an extensive survey in our community and the surrounding territory to determine what help will be available during the next canning season and from all indications we are going to be very short and it is going to be necessary for us to get foreign help to pack our crop of peas and corn. Unless this help is available we are satisfied that many acres of these canning crops will not be harvested.

It is for the above reasons we are writing you to lend your support and to recommend to Congress a furtherance of this program so that sufficient funds will be appropriated to continue the importation of foreign laborers after June 1 so that our crops can be properly handled.

We would appreciate receiving an acknowledgment of receipt of this letter.

We hope that we may have your cooperation.

Thanking you in advance for your attention to this and wishing you the season's greetings, we remain

Yours very truly,

FUHREMANN CANNING Co.,
A. H. FUHREMANN.

The CHAIRMAN. I think there is one thing that has been brought out in the questions asked Colonel Buie that he may not care to answer, and that is this, in regard to whose fault it was. If he answers correctly, I am sure the colonel will have to say it is the fault of Congress. We passed the legislation and brought into existence the unemployment situation here, and if he answers correctly he will have to say that we are responsible. It is not Colonel Buie or any other witness before the committee, but the Congress itself that has been at fault.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do you have any figures on the number of people on the unemployment rolls who are unable to do this work? I suppose you have figures on unemployment as prepared by the United States Employment Service?

Mr. BUIE. I presume so; I have never dealt with them, but I presume the United States Employment Service is in every State in the Union; and they should have the figures.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Well, I do not quite understand how they operate.

Mr. BUIE. I do not represent the United States Employment Service.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Who do you represent?

Mr. BUIE. I represent the Labor Branch of the Production and Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I do not see how you can work efficiently unless you have some connection with the unemployment situation in the respective States.

Mr. BUIE. Well, sir, that is not the official function that I have in this program. There are agencies that do have that, and that is the State extension service.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. All right; I want to get on that too. So you completely ignore the State employment offices even as to unemployment in the various States. In other words, you ignore all that.

Mr. BUIE. I would feel that they have made a pretty good survey in regard to the labor situation in their States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And you do not check on them to find out whether they are right or wrong?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; because the State director of extension is the final word on what comes out of the State to me. The Federal Extension Service, which is supervisory over the State extension services, is in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And so the director is one of your branches in the Department of Agriculture, like you?

Mr. BUIE. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Now the State, you say, has nothing to do with this labor except to distribute it. That is the point.

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; the State determines the need. They make the survey.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When you say "State," who do you mean?

Mr. BUIE. The State extension service.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Do they have any connection with the State unemployment service?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know what the official connection is but I presume there is some connection with the United States Employment Service?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You only presume that; you have no knowledge of any contact between the State extension service with the State employment service?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir; I have definite knowledge of that. I wanted to explain that to you, Mr. Zimmerman. We have two States in the country, or one particularly—New York State—in which the functions that are normally performed in other States by the Extension Service are performed by the United States Employment Service under a contract between those two agencies. I beg your pardon, I don't mean the United States Employment Service but I mean the State employment which comes out of the old United States Employment Service. Now that organization in New York State handles the functions of this State extension service.

Mr. PACE. Then at the Atlantic City conference did you receive a report from New York as to unemployment in New York?

Mr. BUIE. We got a report from them for 1,900 workers in September.

Mr. PACE. And you did not ask what unemployment was when they came in with a request for foreign labor?

Mr. BUIE. I did not.

Mr. PACE. Now at Salt Lake City, Chicago, and Atlantic City conferences, at no time was an inquiry made when these requests were filed with you as to the unemployment situation, as to what it was in the respective States?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; our procedure does not work it out that way.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I understand you, the State extension service has no connection that you know of with the State unemployment service, so far as you know; is that right?

Mr. BUIE. As far as I know, I do not know what the relations are.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. And your set-up has no connection with the State unemployment service?

Mr. BUIE. We do not deal with the State unemployment people.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. So that your organization then does not deal actually with the question of unemployment; and while you are taking day by day more power from the State and wanting more power there is no relation or connection between you and the State unemployment service; is that right?

Mr. BUIE. I cannot answer that question, Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How many men do you have working in Utah in your organization?

Mr. BUIE. Not over eight.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Not over eight?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How many State extensions do you have?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Well, you are interested in the unemployment program, which is to get people to work?

Mr. BUIE. The State extension?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Yes.

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir; I think they are very much interested in it.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How many men do they have?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How many does the State unemployment service in Utah have?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Well, don't you think now it would be rather helpful—I am not critical of your organization—don't you think you better get a little coordination somewhere so that we would have a unified plan of meeting this problem?

Mr. BUIE. Mr. Zimmerman——

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am asking you frankly, that is the point I am getting at.

Mr. BUIE. When these certifications reach the office of labor, or the Labor Branch they are, I feel, very fully coordinated.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. They are fully coordinated but you do not know at what point down the line they came together?

Mr. BUIE. I do not know, that is the very thing. I cannot get out in these States and find out. It takes all my time to run the Labor Branch.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am rather inclined to believe from what the gentleman already testified that the gentlemen who will testify later will probably be better able to answer the questions. I do want to get this in the record. Somebody has charge of the contacts between the Department of Agriculture and the State employment services, and which one does that?

Mr. BUIE. The State extension service has the primary responsibility for letting contracts to any other agency to handle the work.

Mr. POAGE. Then may I ask you this question?

I listened carefully and you did not mention the State of Texas in any of the five regions that you have mentioned?

Mr. BUIE. No, sir; it is not in division No. 5.

Mr. POAGE. Is that because Texas is not in one of those regions that you do not show imported foreign labor?

Mr. BUIE. Texas would be definitely in No. 3 division, but it was not listed because they do not import foreign workers into Texas.

Mr. POAGE. You did not bring anybody into Texas?

Mr. BUIE. That is right.

Mr. ANDRESEN. That is because they swam across the river.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to delay the committee, but I would like to bring this out, and I am sure the gentleman from Utah agrees. Those figures he read to us as far as unemployment is concerned have very little bearing upon supplying temporary foreign labor because those figures that he gave represent men, women, and children. To be of any value those figures would have to be broken down, to determine the men, women, and children, and he knows and I know they will not take a temporary position out on a farm. A good many of them know nothing about a farm and by the time you got them trained so that they could thin the beets the beet crop would be ruined. So I think those figures Mr. Granger gave you are of little value until they can be broken down so that we would know who was out of a job in Utah that could and would accept farm employment.

Mr. GRANGER. When people come before this committee asking us to permit the furnishing of foreign labor, they should have figures covering the subject. In Utah, as I cited, they have paid \$6,000,000 unemployment compensation. I do not know who they were, but I notice every county in the State is represented there with a fair proportion of unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Chair can say as far as Colonel Buie is concerned he was asked to come up here and give us this information; Now he is up here and we have asked him a number of questions about a subject with which he is not familiar, namely, unemployment and unemployment compensation. We have spent the whole morning on the matter. We can get the information from the Department but I don't believe we should expect the Department of Agriculture to send people up here to give us statistical information that we can get ourselves.

Mr. HALL. In line with what the gentleman says, I was listening carefully to the questioning of the colonel and all I have to say is that while we have the right to question his administration, after all I think the final conclusion of the whole job is that the fault is really in our own lap. We restricted—we directed the colonel and his organization to go ahead with the program, to follow it out, and I assume they have followed the intent of Congress at least to a certain extent and I think these penetrating questions of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle should be directed, to a certain extent, to ourselves. After all, we passed this legislation, and it is interesting to note that the legislation was sponsored by many of the people on the other side of the aisle who are today raising the question, and so for that reason I think we ought to be a little bit generous with the colonel and be patient in asking him questions. On the other hand, he has been submitted to a pretty severe grilling and if it is the colonel's fault it is our fault and I think we should make amends for it by producing a constructive program which we can carry out.

Mr. PACE. I think the colonel can take care of himself.

The CHAIRMAN. Colonel Buie, you can be back tomorrow, can you not?

Mr. BUIE. I will be here, sir, as long as you are in session.

The CHAIRMAN. We have another witness who cannot be here later and I promised him an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, when the colonel comes back tomorrow morning, since your survey was of the date of February 1, 1947, I wonder if you could secure figures from the United States Employment Service as to the number of unemployed in the various States, as of the same date, and insert that in the record?

Mr. BUIE. For all the States mentioned in the report?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. And try to break them down in the various categories as to whether they are men or women and the type of work they do.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, we have a clerk who can get that information. Is that satisfactory to you, Colonel?

Mr. BUIE. Yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. That will be satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. We will excuse you until tomorrow morning.

We have with us this morning Mr. Towson, of Maryland, whom we would be glad to hear at this time.

(The following tables show by States and by months the number of initial claims for unemployment compensation and servicemen's readjustment allowances for the year 1946:)

Initial claims for unemployment compensation received in local offices, by State and month, 1946

Region and State	Total initial claims, January 1946	Total initial claims, February 1946	Total initial claims, March 1946	Total initial claims, April 1946	Total initial claims, May 1946	Total initial claims, June 1946	Total initial claims, July 1946	Total initial claims, August 1946	Total initial claims, September 1946	Total initial claims, October 1946	Total initial claims, November 1946	Total initial claims, December 1946
Total	1, 234, 484	946, 302	773, 587	979, 816	1, 119, 122	760, 674	698, 541	541, 263	580, 300	681, 592	620, 076	908, 668
Region I:												
Connecticut.....	20, 612	20, 179	11, 246	40, 718	8, 983	6, 952	10, 754	5, 937	5, 179	6, 411	6, 390	9, 279
Maine.....	4, 856	3, 559	3, 465	11, 245	3, 353	2, 718	3, 381	3, 241	1, 858	2, 147	2, 891	4, 847
Massachusetts.....	36, 118	27, 291	22, 598	44, 988	31, 205	23, 550	27, 060	24, 195	22, 224	24, 799	25, 302	39, 138
New Hampshire.....	2, 344	1, 746	1, 238	3, 640	1, 607	989	1, 026	5, 032	1, 202	1, 361	1, 315	2, 126
Rhode Island.....	10, 697	7, 877	7, 854	11, 408	5, 839	4, 471	6, 492	4, 800	3, 571	4, 099	3, 683	5, 053
Vermont.....	1, 241	761	750	2, 202	1, 026	407	401	364	323	465	382	5, 996
Regions II-III:												
Delaware.....	2, 805	1, 944	1, 439	1, 629	1, 695	1, 043	1, 185	1, 079	1, 025	1, 712	1, 375	1, 760
New Jersey.....	71, 822	43, 066	36, 066	29, 723	28, 350	24, 711	31, 559	29, 028	35, 862	36, 079	27, 938	41, 876
New York.....	155, 719	119, 795	144, 522	110, 394	321, 736	190, 989	126, 329	99, 018	113, 965	160, 934	155, 799	198, 574
Pennsylvania.....	227, 083	142, 063	55, 752	83, 889	108, 079	91, 469	52, 474	35, 497	40, 574	95, 790	49, 773	74, 043
Region IV:												
District of Columbia.....	1, 549	1, 295	1, 046	1, 128	1, 064	1, 058	1, 158	1, 050	941	1, 226	1, 158	1, 673
Maryland.....	14, 574	11, 519	7, 926	64, 849	15, 913	9, 248	8, 941	5, 325	6, 556	6, 577	5, 692	9, 623
North Carolina.....	6, 828	6, 365	8, 022	8, 067	7, 454	4, 681	5, 903	7, 419	5, 041	4, 492	3, 940	6, 993
Virginia.....	6, 113	6, 312	5, 668	4, 742	22, 572	5, 363	4, 944	4, 235	3, 519	3, 646	3, 735	4, 099
West Virginia.....	15, 649	13, 193	10, 201	15, 861	10, 887	9, 178	10, 515	7, 145	6, 083	6, 324	6, 473	15, 002
Region V:												
Kentucky.....	13, 631	11, 480	10, 126	13, 301	10, 128	6, 898	6, 838	7, 751	5, 823	6, 192	4, 960	5, 991
Michigan.....	66, 863	65, 724	49, 106	51, 680	108, 372	85, 213	38, 868	41, 659	52, 134	36, 907	24, 500	96, 615
Ohio.....	37, 917	41, 857	29, 429	29, 201	29, 322	19, 615	16, 362	11, 226	18, 245	17, 054	14, 912	25, 150
Region VI:												
Illinois.....	67, 171	55, 616	41, 845	159, 316	113, 937	47, 563	45, 976	36, 085	36, 990	35, 263	31, 574	52, 137
Indiana.....	43, 500	33, 321	30, 608	19, 353	33, 802	16, 844	15, 761	12, 182	10, 224	14, 057	12, 361	19, 943
Wisconsin.....	9, 299	10, 251	7, 911	5, 864	13, 859	7, 279	5, 738	3, 442	4, 666	3, 541	3, 641	7, 608
Region VII:												
Alabama.....	18, 960	11, 662	9, 811	7, 368	9, 531	10, 473	9, 988	9, 373	6, 954	6, 292	6, 386	10, 219
Florida.....	9, 360	6, 254	5, 822	6, 326	7, 136	8, 337	10, 143	6, 334	5, 812	7, 931	5, 861	7, 314
Georgia.....	9, 366	6, 573	7, 302	6, 148	5, 969	5, 322	5, 588	5, 196	4, 620	5, 263	5, 912	7, 376
Mississippi.....	2, 284	3, 862	3, 260	2, 906	2, 596	2, 436	3, 620	2, 553	2, 158	2, 208	3, 214	3, 024
South Carolina.....	3, 815	2, 867	2, 643	4, 093	2, 519	2, 519	3, 032	2, 553	2, 407	3, 262	2, 543	3, 431
Tennessee.....	14, 333	13, 194	11, 937	11, 927	9, 770	7, 922	8, 967	8, 051	7, 878	9, 220	7, 468	8, 566
Region VIII:												
Iowa.....	8, 345	5, 577	4, 117	4, 432	4, 548	4, 309	3, 648	3, 440	6, 757	3, 018	2, 637	4, 489
Minnesota.....	14, 231	14, 687	8, 741	6, 242	8, 229	4, 883	4, 782	3, 263	4, 018	3, 011	3, 864	7, 703
Nebraska.....	3, 835	2, 456	2, 003	1, 715	1, 613	1, 630	1, 749	1, 575	3, 524	1, 329	1, 339	2, 184
North Dakota.....	1, 182	636	581	385	388	363	431	228	231	204	387	815
South Dakota.....	779	445	407	339	292	337	393	354	1, 195	252	341	457

Region IX:											
Arkansas	10,432	7,929	6,825	5,774	5,021	4,823	12,769	5,525	4,052	4,154	5,305
Kansas	9,479	8,201	7,312	6,101	6,269	5,104	5,172	4,557	6,569	4,460	4,522
Missouri	47,508	28,685	25,406	22,927	22,877	18,585	24,903	24,805	23,577	22,906	20,825
Oklahoma	12,824	9,904	9,622	9,000	7,904	7,227	8,333	6,892	6,573	6,479	6,028
Region X:											
Louisiana	15,582	14,611	11,541	9,186	10,168	8,362	9,782	7,882	7,447	9,780	8,419
New Mexico	1,231	985	1,106	1,278	804	592	729	564	446	647	658
Texas	24,749	19,887	16,372	13,886	13,885	11,902	12,954	11,443	9,582	10,465	10,769
Region XI:											
Colorado	4,092	3,230	2,865	7,551	2,597	2,285	2,020	1,339	1,133	1,158	1,611
Idaho	2,627	1,932	1,425	1,176	855	948	1,104	593	299	442	1,319
Montana	2,768	2,606	2,134	3,058	1,706	1,064	1,274	893	1,155	941	1,340
Utah	6,089	3,536	2,453	4,338	1,833	1,447	4,927	1,423	985	1,285	1,989
Wyoming	672	605	445	435	326	324	305	201	207	190	296
Region XII:											
Arizona	3,993	2,743	3,433	2,654	2,324	1,972	2,111	1,748	1,538	1,877	1,961
California	133,766	109,653	104,831	99,766	85,951	71,327	76,046	66,508	76,015	84,791	94,554
Nevada	1,109	981	1,008	927	736	556	651	586	582	696	757
Oregon	23,390	13,176	10,877	9,607	7,979	5,896	5,939	5,375	4,605	5,816	8,376
Washington	28,066	22,990	20,055	18,133	12,354	9,373	55,438	12,559	13,350	14,434	22,659
Regions XIII and XIV:											
Alaska	471	107	141	191	85	76	31	47	78	228	337
Hawaii	63	111	70	97	50	71	47	65	548	677	605

Source: Social Security Administration, Bureau of Employment Security, Program Division.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Initial claims received for servicemen's readjustment allowances, January 1946 through January 1947, by State ¹

Agency	January 1946	February 1946	March 1946	April 1946	May 1946	June 1946	July 1946	August 1946	September 1946	October 1946	November 1946	December 1946	January 1947
Total.....	1,030,171	908,023	801,316	690,362	740,692	602,317	656,673	602,165	449,013	412,974	405,087	582,501	618,597
Alabama.....	15,941	14,792	11,744	10,477	12,079	10,880	10,962	9,921	5,508	4,788	6,171	8,512	9,804
Alaska.....	266	180	229	241	84	77	38	36	77	207	332	266	303
Arizona.....	3,976	3,726	4,432	3,892	3,877	3,473	3,603	3,499	2,507	2,475	2,621	3,127	4,933
Arkansas.....	11,708	9,735	8,479	6,564	6,710	5,335	5,951	6,283	3,775	4,284	6,061	6,889	8,136
California.....	64,144	63,299	63,762	54,077	50,186	45,938	52,164	44,932	35,286	35,980	42,179	49,586	52,644
Colorado.....	6,923	6,937	6,352	5,203	5,379	4,664	4,713	4,242	2,966	2,259	2,479	3,821	5,180
Connecticut.....	18,049	15,326	13,811	11,225	10,757	9,229	12,106	9,874	5,560	4,596	3,708	5,830	6,892
Delaware.....	2,204	1,924	1,563	1,327	1,579	1,258	1,458	1,315	997	1,209	1,206	1,395	1,561
District of Columbia.....	5,453	5,103	4,827	4,112	3,768	3,007	3,026	2,562	1,932	1,460	1,158	1,304	1,962
Florida.....	9,758	9,969	9,402	9,333	10,279	10,778	11,971	10,267	8,222	6,878	6,467	8,675	10,618
Georgia.....	17,296	13,831	13,821	12,784	13,403	12,103	13,317	12,523	9,678	7,925	8,099	9,660	12,681
Hawaii.....	54	135	104	112	91	121	245	318	246	335	337	339	547
Idaho.....	2,786	2,498	1,801	1,127	912	887	609	585	340	262	1,498	3,165	3,058
Illinois.....	57,944	53,014	43,107	39,741	53,467	31,654	35,001	32,485	20,802	18,402	17,773	27,291	28,121
Indiana.....	35,250	28,898	21,777	18,040	25,894	14,905	15,914	15,448	13,160	10,748	10,522	17,060	16,139
Iowa.....	14,312	11,591	9,285	6,853	8,153	8,316	7,314	8,255	6,502	4,057	4,420	7,730	8,474
Kansas.....	11,103	10,020	9,378	7,678	8,213	7,279	8,125	8,122	3,299	4,402	5,302	6,697	7,674
Kentucky.....	16,750	21,018	13,938	13,564	13,661	10,863	10,385	9,255	3,442	7,325	7,990	8,287	210,246
Louisiana.....	13,424	13,212	13,324	10,484	11,766	10,315	10,332	10,321	7,199	7,408	8,143	8,674	12,118
Maine.....	5,968	5,252	5,214	4,519	3,401	3,523	4,343	3,504	2,590	2,412	2,712	4,695	4,469
Maryland.....	13,369	12,427	9,729	7,117	7,088	4,779	4,813	4,250	3,321	1,645	1,618	2,441	3,192
Massachusetts.....	49,463	40,966	34,900	28,299	27,881	25,189	31,555	27,320	18,665	17,670	13,468	23,170	27,980
Michigan.....	53,844	49,425	39,518	34,263	51,494	30,869	28,538	32,184	27,007	19,704	13,415	37,291	28,099
Minnesota.....	21,796	18,417	14,650	10,678	13,436	11,520	11,271	9,964	7,950	5,934	7,680	13,151	(9)
Mississippi.....	8,409	6,929	4,585	5,573	5,553	5,516	6,275	6,237	3,552	3,470	4,239	4,338	6,402
Missouri.....	34,024	25,961	22,150	18,406	19,458	17,334	19,484	19,716	14,616	13,946	14,302	18,889	20,875
Montana.....	3,946	3,647	3,385	2,700	2,541	2,197	1,941	1,743	1,728	1,219	2,296	2,873	3,100
Nebraska.....	2,885	3,373	3,055	2,478	2,531	2,550	2,471	3,045	1,473	1,531	1,473	2,604	(9)
Nevada.....	600	656	780	824	716	580	618	607	444	522	534	721	(9)
New Hampshire.....	4,196	3,393	3,264	2,620	2,441	2,387	2,822	2,575	1,951	1,673	1,333	2,335	3,016
New Jersey.....	41,442	38,645	32,736	26,208	25,934	23,201	26,616	22,219	18,284	15,350	12,633	18,867	19,968
New Mexico.....	3,340	3,475	2,937	2,622	2,452	2,173	2,777	2,391	1,640	1,842	2,418	2,849	3,638
New York.....	148,854	128,236	115,714	102,801	106,202	93,161	108,135	102,232	94,016	77,864	61,781	90,990	299,487
North Carolina.....	14,335	14,134	12,789	11,951	13,145	11,791	13,813	12,499	8,248	6,050	5,808	7,670	11,526
North Dakota.....	2,430	2,256	2,038	1,031	1,092	1,313	1,000	517	448	685	1,304	2,032	(9)
Ohio.....	37,829	39,784	32,425	26,646	25,111	19,591	19,063	15,182	9,133	10,026	10,737	20,616	20,792
Oklahoma.....	13,760	11,911	11,774	10,464	10,736	9,135	10,980	10,353	5,890	6,120	6,611	7,941	10,586
Oregon.....	10,962	9,387	8,767	7,195	6,171	5,514	5,944	5,667	3,786	4,519	6,617	8,224	9,505
Pennsylvania.....	106,917	79,569	65,923	59,384	64,963	48,891	51,830	42,236	30,191	42,601	28,346	48,776	43,394
Puerto Rico.....	4,950	5,058	6,256	6,769	5,577	3,889	2,601	1,934	1,603	1,570	1,701	1,758	3,788
Rhode Island.....	5,314	4,725	4,431	4,063	3,973	3,455	4,162	4,311	2,447	2,245	2,177	2,986	3,652
South Carolina.....	8,826	7,608	7,205	6,811	8,153	6,835	7,901	6,601	4,678	4,110	3,946	4,664	6,282
South Dakota.....	1,770	1,760	1,606	1,053	1,188	1,253	1,148	1,157	1,134	754	1,007	1,449	2,010

Tennessee	20,184	16,350	15,882	12,631	13,049	11,112	10,407	10,697	7,124	6,280	6,702	7,971	10,813
Texas	33,946	28,459	31,239	24,489	23,387	19,468	22,042	19,559	13,947	12,566	15,878	18,548	26,880
Utah	5,105	4,351	3,599	3,574	3,155	3,345	3,340	2,885	2,033	1,494	2,366	3,201	3,637
Vermont	1,905	1,549	1,610	1,145	1,114	3,946	3,950	7,180	619	493	4,483	1,148	1,299
Virginia	10,038	10,526	9,457	8,490	9,740	6,519	7,611	7,663	5,028	4,256	4,594	6,201	8,624
Washington	12,041	10,855	10,307	8,804	8,758	7,473	8,154	7,663	5,791	5,889	10,148	12,367	12,433
West Virginia	20,539	15,752	15,375	18,448	13,430	10,236	11,668	11,227	7,622	7,969	8,999	11,537	10,732
Wisconsin	18,915	16,994	15,928	11,307	15,352	12,943	14,408	12,878	8,186	5,941	5,795	10,827	11,772
Wyoming	928	965	952	765	652	547	498	385	240	184	501	1,063	1,245

¹ Initial claims for all States through December 1946 represent intrastate plus agent State claims. Initial claims for January 1947 represent intrastate plus liable State claims except as noted.

² Initial claims represent intrastate plus agent State claims.

³ Not available.

Source: Research and Statistics Division, Readjustment Allowance Service, Veterans' Administration.

**STATEMENT OF A. L. TOWSON, PRESIDENT, KENT LABOR
ASSOCIATION, MARYLAND**

Mr. Towson. Mr. Chairman, I am A. L. Towson of the State of Maryland, county of Kent, president of the Kent Labor Association, which was a cooperative organization set up to handle imported labor that we are discussing this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. Towson. In Maryland we are now making our plans for the coming year. We are getting set as to canning and freezing of crops and certain goals have been set up by the Department of Agriculture to be done by the farmers in that area this year.

We feel we need just as much—almost as much—help this year as we had last from this program and we therefore are asking that it be continued.

Last year we had 1,700 foreign workers in the State of Maryland, handling for the most part perishable crops. We had them harvest our perishable crops. At that same time that these people were working for us in Maryland we had unemployment in the State of Maryland. I personally lost crops because I went to the unemployment service and asked for 50 and got none. There were one-hundred-and-some people on the unemployment roll but I got none. I made a second request and got none.

That is why you will find, gentlemen, that the farmers are going and pleading with the Extension Service for the carrying on of this program. We have not obtained any help in my State from the unemployment service.

Early in the war those same people that you are asking, or somebody is suggesting, help us now were recruiting men and women to move out of that area and go into different places in industry. Now most of those people have returned to the State, or a great many of them have, and it is evident by the records of last year that they would rather get \$20 a week unemployment compensation than come out and cut my spinach, pick my beans, or pick my tomatoes.

My experience is a matter of record. We made the requests and we did not get any help. Now this is a rural area. We have known of some of the unemployed in the city of Baltimore coming out to help the farmers, but you cannot get them over on the Eastern Shore of Maryland.

We served a great many farmers last year with this service that brought in the foreign workers. In fact we helped 5,617 farmers in the State.

Mr. Poage. How many did you help?

Mr. Towson. We helped 5,617 farmers during the year in the State of Maryland.

Mr. Poage. You furnished foreign labor to the farmers?

Mr. Towson. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. Towson. There are about 7,000 farmers in the State of Maryland who would naturally employ more labor so that you can see this took care of quite a large number of the farmers who would naturally employ extra labor. There are a great many more farmers than that in the State of Maryland but not all of them require extra help, so this took care of most of the farmers who required help.

We spent \$162,000, and \$24,000 of that camp facilities.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What did you spend that on?

Mr. TOWSON. On the Extension Service; \$24,000 was for crop improvements, camp improvements; \$138,000 operating expenses. They have now 17 men on the staff, stand-by staff and it heads up to 78 during the busy season.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. How much is spent altogether?

Mr. TOWSON. \$162,000, of which \$24,000 is classified for camp improvements.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The total amount is \$162,000?

Mr. TOWSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The camp is how much of that?

Mr. TOWSON. \$24,000 for camp facilities.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Was that spent by the Extension Service?

Mr. TOWSON. I believe so.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What was the rest?

Mr. TOWSON. \$138,000 for operating expenses?

We are right now uncertain at the beginning of the growing season, and we do not know what crops to lay out or how much. The canners are trying to contract with the farmers for corn, tomatoes, peas, and beans and it is a critical situation because there is not enough labor that wants to work in that area to carry out the program that has been set up by the Department of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. PACE. I have figured it roughly and you spent \$162,000 on 1,700 men and that is \$100 a man?

Mr. TOWSON. We also set up a program to get boys out. We even got boys out, and got colored boys from Washington. That was part of the Service and we also got migrant workers too.

Mr. PACE. Well, as a citizen and taxpayer, Mr. Towson, just what do you think is the answer to this problem of unemployment and still sending to foreign countries to get labor? What is your answer to it?

Mr. TOWSON. That is what happened previously. I have heard all these questions before. Before the war, in Kent County I had plenty of labor. I am talking about normally. The colored folk got thin during the winter and fat during the summer. They worked during the summertime. I could get all the labor I wanted and women and children would come to pick my beans, cut my spinnach, and pick tomatoes.

Then the war came and they went to the factories, powder factories and such, and they got big money. They got fairly prosperous, their children did not work and the old folk were warm and they did not work because they were well kept. So that went out. Even the house labor left the well-to-do citizens in Chestertown to help me pick beans. I had all kinds of complaints saying that I was taking away their house help. Those days I had all the help I needed all the time.

Then came unemployment insurance and they are now not interested to anything like what they were before the war in doing field work.

Mr. PACE. Do you think the trouble probably arose as a result of the word "suitable" in the Social Security Act? Do you think that caused the trouble?

Mr. TOWSON. I personally believe the Social Security Act has done a lot of good.

Mr. PACE. I mean in the fact that to employ people you must let them choose their work; the Social Security Act provides unless they are offered "suitable" employment?

Mr. TOWSON. Yes, sir; that leaves the choice with them. There are no classifications in our county of the unemployment rolls.

Mr. PACE. None of the unemployed have been offered "suitable" employment?

Mr. TOWSON. I do not think they have been offered any.

Mr. HILL. You are only talking about temporary work for say 10 days, rather than work for 6 months. A man would not want to do that job; he would not have any inducement. You would take them out in the hot sun for 10 hours to pick your beans, and then send them back and pay them so much when the job is done. Is that what you tell them?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right, sir.

Mr. HILL. And we are talking about temporary aid.

Mr. TOWSON. And I think in a long-range program you might have some of this unemployment by getting those people moved around and moving those people from their homes who are migrant-minded, but that is a much more expensive job and harder than bringing these people in from a foreign country to do temporary work. This is a big labor problem.

Mr. HILL. You would prefer to use domestic labor if you could get it?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right.

Mr. HILL. You would not have these foreign laborers at all if you could get domestic laborers?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right; the quality of work of the foreign laborer is terrible. I am sorry for the day we had to use them but we cannot do otherwise.

Mr. HILL. But if you did not have this transient labor available at the proper time as far as you are concerned you could not produce the crops?

Mr. TOWSON. You are absolutely right.

Mr. HALL. While you are on that general subject of compensation I would like to ask you, Mr. Towson what the average earning capacity of these people is when they are working for you, the individuals?

Mr. TOWSON. I think the minimum set was \$15 a week this year, but we were way over it, about \$25 to \$30 a week.

Mr. HALL. What is the number of weeks they work on the average?

Mr. TOWSON. Well our harvest area runs about 10 weeks. I think so. Now I do not know what the average is but it depends like the Sam Hill on temperature because a considerable proportion of this is piecework and I have had people on our farms earn \$50 to \$60 a week.

Mr. HALL. I think it is fairly understandable when they are on insurance they would not want to sacrifice it under the circumstances?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right.

Mr. HALL. To do part-time work?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You say 10 weeks is about the average?

Mr. TOWSON. Yes, sir; that is our peak demand.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I believe it costs then about \$100 a man to bring in foreign labor to the farm, doesn't it—to bring these people in to do this work?

Mr. TOWSON. I do not know what the costs are. I never figured it, Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. So, in other words the Government is putting up \$8 a week there for these boys?

Mr. TOWSON. That is right, but I think those people are brought in here and moved over the country, Mr. Zimmerman, so that \$100 which you are speaking of would not cover just 10 weeks work. It would be pro rated to the whole period of time that those people are here for useful work. The man I get may be in Florida right now.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I thought that was the cost of your organization, \$162,000, and that would amount to \$10 per man.

Mr. TOWSON. That included migrant labor, prisoner of war activities that we had last year and also bringing these people out of the cities. That does not apply solely to the foreign workers. That was the whole Extension program. It was not all spent on this imported labor, sir.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am glad to get that correction. Those were the figures I called for.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock when we will have representatives of the State unemployment services before the committee.

(Thereupon at 12 o'clock noon the committee adjourned to meet on Thursday, February 6, 1947, at 10 a. m.)

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee on Agriculture met in the committee room, 1310 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Hon. Clifford R. Hope (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Unfortunately the House is meeting at 11 o'clock today, so that we will not have the regular 2-hour session. We have 1 hour and we have a number of people who are here and have to get away. We will try to accommodate as many of them as we can.

I am going to call first on Mr. Ferris from Florida.

Mr. Ferris, will you give the reporter your name and address for the record?

STATEMENT OF JOSIAH FERRIS, JR., VICE PRESIDENT, UNITED STATES SUGAR CORP., CLEWISTON, FLA.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Josiah Ferris, Jr., and I am vice president of the United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.

The United States Sugar Corp. is probably the largest individual employer of farm labor under this program.

If we are unable to continue the use of the foreign labor that we now have in our employ, approximately 3,000 Jamaicans and Barbadoans, we will be unable to harvest and process our 1947-48 crop, which will mean in sugar to the housewives of America a loss of about 200,000,000 pounds.

We are just as anxious as you gentlemen are to put a stop to the use of foreign labor. We much prefer to use domestic labor. In fact, the colored people of Georgia, South Carolina, Mississippi, and the other cotton States, in our opinion, make the very finest agricultural labor in the world, but unfortunately we cannot employ those people now, although we have made continuous efforts for over a year.

I would like to speak a good word for the Labor Branch of the Department of Agriculture under Colonel Buie. They have been very helpful to us in obtaining these workers. We have not always gotten as many as we would have liked to have, but during the war, when no other workers were available, they have kept us supplied with these workers so that we could go ahead and produce sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any questions?

Mr. PACE. I have just one question, Mr. Ferris. If arrangements were made whereby you could negotiate with these West Indians and bring them in, would that be satisfactory?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir, that would be satisfactory.

Mr. PACE. Your company would be able and willing to pay the transportation charges, and so forth?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir. However, if we were permitted to retain the workers that we now have, that could be done at no additional expense to our Government. As I understand it, the Government has already set aside money to pay the transportation of these workers from the port of entry back to their native country.

Mr. PACE. When did these workers come in?

Mr. FERRIS. Some of them that we have, came in at the very start when the first contingent came across. We have had them for 3, nearly 4 years now.

Mr. PACE. They do not go back each year?

Mr. FERRIS. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you furnish them year-round employment?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir; we should—and, as a matter of fact, are trying to recruit domestic workers on the basis of the year-round employment for themselves and all members of their family who are old enough to accept employment.

Now let me add, please, that my company furnishes medical care for these people. The Government does not pay any of that expense. We furnish them housing and the worker pays so much a day for his meals. So after they get to this country from the port of entry we take them over, pay their transportation from there to our plantations.

We have agreed with the Government, when we no longer have use for them, we will return them at our expense to the port from which they are to be sent back home. So if we are permitted to keep them, it will not cost the United States Government 1 penny.

Mr. PACE. Do you want to keep them forever?

Mr. FERRIS. No, sir; only until we can replace them with domestic workers. Every time we can bring in a domestic worker who will stay with us, we will be glad to release one of the foreign workers.

Mr. PACE. Do you pay \$1 an hour?

Mr. FERRIS. We pay piecework rates, which if the worker is willing to work for at least 8 hours a day, he can earn enough to average him \$1 an hour. We have a great many workers on the plantations who are getting that rate.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Do you mean you cannot get native labor for \$1 an hour?

Mr. FERRIS. No, sir; you cannot get them to work in the sugarcane fields. It is hard work, and people who have had a taste of high wages and comparatively short hours in war plants so far haven't yet decided to go back to real hard work.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Ferris, I am inquiring in regard to transportation.

The Federal Government will put out over \$5,500,000 for transportation this year for labor, and do you think it is right for the Federal Government to pay the transportation bill for the benefit of your company?

Mr. FERRIS. It does not go to the benefit of my company and I agree with you, the Government should not put it up.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, who does get the benefit of it?

Mr. FERRIS. My company does not. When we take the workers at the port of entry they are our responsibility. We take them to our place, we furnish medical care and housing, and they pay for their food.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Just where is your port of entry?

Mr. FERRIS. In our case it is Port Everglades, Fla.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Your port is very small?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The Government is paying most of the transportation costs.

Mr. FERRIS. The Government transports him from his home in Jamaica or Barbados to Port Everglades.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And the Government takes him back and pays all the transportation.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir; these people that we have are here. The Government has already paid that transportation and they have set aside an amount to return them, so it will cost the Government no more.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Will they return the men who are working on your plantations so that you will have to get others?

Mr. FERRIS. No, sir; so long as they are here we would like to keep them until we can replace them with domestic labor. It will cost the Government nothing to keep them here because we take care of them, and the Government is already obligated to pay the man's return transportation from the port of entry to his home.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Would you be agreeable to doing that?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, we would.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Ferris, do I understand if you cannot get this extension of the bill that is before us, that is, the original amendment asked for, that you have got to return them?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir; our contract expires on the 30th of June.

Mr. GROSS. And then they must be returned?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes, sir; and I rather suspect that they will start to move them out before that date. They will not let them stay until midnight of the 30th of June.

Mr. GROSS. And you have a permanent problem, work all year round, rather than seasonal work?

Mr. FERRIS. There is seasonal work in the harvest season, but we have year-round work for about 2,000 agricultural workers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How long have you been using foreign labor?

Mr. FERRIS. Since the program first went into effect.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You did not use foreign labor prior to that?

Mr. FERRIS. No, sir; we had an abundance of labor; and, as I said before, we had the very finest labor in the world, that is, the colored people from the Southern Cotton States.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, Mr. Ferris.

Now we have with us representatives of the State employment services. Mr. Victor Christgau, who is going to speak first?

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I would suggest that you hear first from Mr. Rector.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear you, Mr. Rector. Give the reporter your name and official position for the record.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY RECTOR, ESQ., CHIEF COUNSEL, INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION, STATE OF WISCONSIN; INTERSTATE CONFERENCE OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AGENCIES

Mr. RECTOR. My name is Stanley Rector, of Madison, Wis. I am chiefly counsel of the Industrial Commission of the State of Wisconsin, and I am here representing the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies.

The employment security agencies of the States are entrusted with performing two functions in the State government. One is unemployment compensation, and again since November 16 the operation of State employment services, which were returned to the States from the Federal Government, these State agencies embraced dual functions—the payment of benefits and the finding of work for unemployed individuals.

Now I will very briefly try to indicate our position here with reference to H. R. 1388.

We are opposed to the measure in its present form, so far as it relates to a continuation of the domestic agricultural farm-placement program for a full year.

We believe that the domestic farm labor placement program should be transferred from the Department of Agriculture in an orderly manner and the functions of finding jobs for agricultural workers should again be returned to the State employment service.

I would like to distinguish the foreign labor project that is now in operation and is to continue until June 30 of this year from the domestic labor program.

We have no interest, really, in that program. The State could not operate it. It is directly a Federal function to import the labor. The States are not in a position to make the contracts with foreign governments, or service the contracts or take care of the foreign labor when it comes to this country. Whether that is continued, and if it is continued, what department should operate it, whether the Agriculture Department or whether the United States Unemployment Service in the Labor Department, is not a matter of our concern; but we are concerned, gentlemen, simply with one element of this program, and that is the finding of jobs in the local communities with local farmers for local laborers, the so-called domestic or local farm-labor-placement program.

The program was administered by the States quite effectively prior to the war and prior to the taking over by the Federal Government of the State employment services. With the return of this service to the States we feel that the proper servicing of our local farmers and workers can and will be better served through their local employment service offices. We believe their interests demand they be entitled to the same consideration as those of the large producers.

Our reasons are very simple. The domestic farm-labor program is presently supervised, as you know, by the Agriculture extension agencies in the States. There was approximately \$9,100,000 appropriated by the Federal Government last year, and allocated to the State extension services, for finding local labor, local jobs.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. How much was that?

Mr. RECTOR. \$9,100,000. That went to the State agricultural extension services to hire emergency farm labor assistants to help the

county agents to go around the counties and try to find jobs for local labor.

Now, gentlemen, we are in the field with our local employment offices. In my own State of Wisconsin practically all our offices are in rural communities, and outside of three or four large urban districts, those offices are staffed to meet the over-all local labor situation in those districts.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Right there, who is paying for the personnel in those offices?

Mr. RECTOR. There is a grant from the Federal Government to run those offices.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Who pays it?

Mr. RECTOR. The Federal Government is granting the money to the State for the operation of these local employment offices.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And the whole cost is being borne by the Federal Government?

Mr. RECTOR. Under the present law that is right. The Wisconsin State employment service officials believe that with 27 additional persons, many on a part-time basis, and with very little extra travel allowance because our men are all through the State's outlying districts, that with this small number, we could give better service to farmers and workers than is given by the county agents, who are, after all, equipped to do other work. Last year the Wisconsin State Extension Service was allocated \$225,000 for the emergency farm labor program under the present bill.

Mr. PACE. Under your authority you can only find employment for those seeking employment? Is that right?

Mr. RECTOR. Under the present law we are not permitted to utilize the services of the local offices to find agricultural workers jobs. We have the fullest authority, of course, to find industrial and nonagricultural jobs for everybody coming into those offices.

Mr. PACE. I will come to that in a minute.

Mr. RECTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. PACE. Under your authority, from Congress, you can find employment only for those who seek employment?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right.

Mr. PACE. And you cannot go out and try to persuade somebody to work who does not want to work?

Mr. PACE. Now let me ask you this question——

The CHAIRMAN (interposing). You have no authority to recruit labor for any purpose?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right; we have not that authority.

Mr. PACE. I do not see how you possibly could do any more than the county agents are doing in my county. The man there is doing a splendid job. We grow lots of peanuts and cotton, and when the time comes to harvest the peanuts we need on our farms a lot of help, and the county agent helps in rounding up that labor. Now you tell me that under the law you cannot go out and recruit labor. The county agent takes this little fund that the Federal Government gives him and uses it to get results. A good percentage of the farm labor is colored labor. The county agent employs two or three colored leaders, and they negotiate a price per stack or per day. Those leaders recruit 500 or 1,000 workers and they have them at the courthouse Monday morning. The farmers bring their trucks in and one

will take 3 out to his farm and another will want 30, and he will take them out to his farm, and that help will harvest the crop, and that is the only way they can do to save it.

Now in cotton-picking time it is exactly the same thing. The county agent gets on the job and through white and colored leaders he collects the labor. He arranges with the farmers to come in trucks and take the labor to the farms and bring them back.

Now you tell me you cannot do any of that, and yet you want additional money.

Mr. RECTOR. I misunderstood when I said we did not have that authority. We have full authority to recruit labor and to make placements of that labor with employers needing workers. We do have recruitment programs, but when you ask, have we any authority to get men to work other than those who want to work, we do not; but we do go out and help people.

Mr. PACE. For example, in my State you would have to open an office or at least establish a staff in every county, to do a comparable job to that the county agents are now doing.

Mr. RECTOR. Mr. Pace, I think in every county in my State, and I believe in every county in the United States, that there is a contact. It is not a local full-time staff, so far as being in every county in my State of Wisconsin, but there are traveling representatives out of the local offices going into the community and every crossroads in that county. During seasonal peaks, however, we do have men full time in the area and we propose under our program to do so again.

Mr. PACE. I am glad to know it is done. It is a matter of contacts. In the height of the season this is about the busiest job you have ever seen, where we have 10 or 15 people working day and night recruiting labor and getting everything coordinated, so where the farmer John Smith needs 10 men today and none tomorrow, that labor is shifted from his farm to another farm. It is one of the most highly complicated jobs you have seen, and in my own county you would have to have a staff of 5 to 10 men to do what the county agent does.

Mr. RECTOR. Well we did have, Congressman Pace, a migratory labor recruitment program and a local labor recruitment program under the State services before, and we contemplate reinstituting one now.

Here is a very important factor that has not been given, I think, full consideration; namely, the relation of the payment of benefits in the rural communities to this program. Now, as it is, people who are out of work, unemployed, your veterans coming back drawing VA allowances, and those people who are coming back from the industries in the cities, going into the farm areas, they register for work at our employment offices. We are only able to offer them industrial employment and there is none in a lot of these communities. The substantial number of jobs in these communities are agricultural.

We cannot offer them these agricultural jobs. We cannot expect them to work at a task other than that for which they signed up, industrial work, which does not exist in that community. So there are many jobs on the farm that are not offered them. Farmers are crying for help, and yet there are hundreds of people on the benefit rolls in the outlying communities, and thousands throughout the country.

That is a tremendous drain, gentlemen, upon Federal funds, when it comes to VA allowances.

I can illustrate that by one example which I have right here before me. It was taken from my State and it is representative; I think you will find it in every State, in every agricultural State in the Union. We have three urban areas where we made a test last June 29, or rather the week ending June 29 of last year, which was at the height of our agricultural season. We took 3 rural areas and found in those areas that there were 4,375 veterans claiming readjustment allowances in those 3 rural areas; and of this total 898, or 900, were drawing benefits to exceed 20 weeks—they had been on the benefit rolls 20 weeks, right through the peak of the agricultural season. That is 20 percent.

Now compare that with urban areas. There were 3 urban areas with $2\frac{1}{2}$ times the population, that had 4,817 veterans, but there were only 170 veterans who had been on the readjustment pay roll for 20 weeks. Think of it, 700 percent more veterans in outlying communities claiming extended benefits than in your industrial centers.

To us it is very clear, and being right down there we know what is causing it. You cannot offer jobs. The veterans benefit. They could go to the county agent if they wanted to work, but they do not have to go in order to get this \$20.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you a question right there.

Do you mean to say your representatives in a rural community, where the farmers are crying for help and there is a great need for help, where there are not enough workers available to carry on the farming operations in that community, that under those circumstances your representatives still have to keep people on the unemployment compensation pay rolls? In other words, do your people close their eyes and ears to everything that is going on in the community?

Mr. RECTOR. Obviously that is the situation. We do have certain offices here and there that make referrals that should not be made by law. What can they do? What the law does provide for is that they can tell these people, "You can see your county agent," but the person does not have to see the county agent; and you do not know whether he saw him or not, and you do not know whether he took the job if he got there.

The CHAIRMAN. Couldn't you compel him to furnish some information to you before you put him on the relief roll; that he has been to see the county agent, that he asked the county agent for employment, and the county agent had told him that there was no employment in that vicinity to which he could be assigned? Why can't you do that?

Mr. RECTOR. Well, the way it operates I don't think we could do that under the law. He could come in and say he is willing and able to work and to accept any job in the files of the office that is suitable for him—any jobs in the office that are suitable for him—but we cannot put those agricultural jobs in our files; we cannot interview him, strictly speaking, with reference to an agricultural background and finding that he is predominantly an agricultural laborer and should be there; we cannot do that, but we can only offer him work of what we have on the shelves, wrapped up and ready. He says, "I am ready and willing to work, to take a job that is suitable to me," and we just don't have them.

MR. HOEVEN. Who determines whether it is a suitable job, the applicant or your agency?

MR. RECTOR. Our agency, sir. Our agency makes the first determination. They offer him such jobs as they have that they feel are suitable for him.

MR. HOEVEN. What happens if he thinks the job is not suitable?

MR. RECTOR. Then there is a contest. If we say it is suitable, he can appeal and carry it on to Washington, if need be.

MR. HOEVEN. I suppose very few of those cases arise.

MR. RECTOR. There are not many cases that go through to Washington, but there are quite a few contests in the field.

MR. MURRAY. I want to impress upon every one here that the witness is well qualified, with many years of experience in our State (Wisconsin).

I do want to call attention to one thing which I think was brought out very clearly, that there is nothing that prohibits these other agencies from telling the county agent who there is who wants a job, so that he can make an effort to get them a job; and this cooperation, so far as it has been put into effect, has been in effect for the last 25 years; but that does not solve the problem. The cooperation is there between the services. However, the county agent is many times out of his office and he has very many duties.

Now there is one thing that cannot be too strongly emphasized, and that is that many of those farms are family-sized farms and they cannot afford to pay going rates of wages, and that is why 5,000,000 rural people went to the cities. Now there is only one way we are going to iron this out, and that is by cooperation between the county agent offices and the Employment Service, and at the present time the two appropriations are at cross-purposes.

MR. RECTOR. That is right.

MR. PACE. I would like to have you explain this: I was hoping that there is a common ground here where your department can place on the farm people seeking employment, and still the county agent can do this emergency recruiting in certain seasons that you cannot do. I do not think the county agent should undertake the job as a replacement man, but I do think he should have a right to aid the farmers in recruiting labor in an emergency.

MR. RECTOR. I think that is right. I think that very thing could be done.

MR. ANDRESEN. Is there any reason why we could not provide in this legislation that there should be cooperation between the county agent and the Employment Service, requiring that the county agent advise the Employment Service of the number of men needed so the information would be available on the shelf, so that you could offer positions to these unemployed persons when they come to make application for work?

MR. RECTOR. It seems to me that the most direct way in these communities would be to have the farmers and processors come direct to the local offices where the whole situation can be reviewed, let the card be made up as to how long the job would be and what wages would be paid, and so forth, rather than have it come in a roundabout way through the county agents. With all that detail it breaks down. The county agent is a busy man and when it comes time to make plans for an individual farmer, the county agent does not have the card index,

he does not have the trained interviewers, and so forth, that are so necessary.

It seems to me that rather than bring into the State of Wisconsin \$225,000 for the county agent emergency farm labor system, we could do a much better job in our State employment service with some additional employees, say 27, and many of them on a part-time basis, with an increase in our present annual budget of \$75,000. We believe that amount would permit us to do a much better job for the farmers and processors than is now being done with \$225,000. In other words, for one-half to one-third what it is now costing, the State employment service could do a much better job, and the rest of the funds could be saved.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Why couldn't it do it with the same amount of money that you have now, if you were to take it over?

Mr. RECTOR. No, sir; we could not do it if we are going to give these farmers and these local processors real value. We have got to have additional help during the various seasons, as the pea-canning season, and other crop seasons; but we figure that we could do that with certain additional help, and we would figure on around 27, most of them part time.

Mr. MURRAY. You would not have all of them on the pay roll all the time?

Mr. RECTOR. No; just part of the time.

Mr. MURRAY. In other words, there may be school teachers who may be used when school is out?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY. And that would be only temporary employment?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right. We would have four or five trained men at headquarters, who we would probably have to keep the whole year around.

Mr. MURRAY. And if a man wanted a job he could go and see the county agent. Now the county agent is a busy man and he is not always there.

Mr. RECTOR. That is true, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Rector, you spoke of \$225,000 of Federal funds going to county agents in Wisconsin?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. For what purpose is that?

Mr. RECTOR. To service the extension service emergency farm labor program for finding workers for farmers.

Our unemployment-compensation program last year ran in the vicinity of around \$800,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. \$800,000?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Plus \$225,000, or \$1,000,000, the Federal Government put in Wisconsin for the purpose of finding farm labor. Is that right?

Mr. RECTOR. Well, that is general all over, of all industries; it was not just for farm labor. We had nothing to do, nor did the USES that had the program last year, that is, neither one had anything to do with the emergency farm labor program last year at all; that was in the Agricultural Extension Service, and they received \$225,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The Extension Service?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And in addition to that your unemployment office received about \$800,000?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; and the USES operated the employment service in our State last year, and received in the vicinity of \$800,000 or \$1,000,000.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. And that work was a duplication?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; it is our contention all through the rural areas there were duplications.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Now in regard to unemployment, you know the great need for farm labor. Could you certify a man for that work, and if he does not work take him off the roll?

Mr. RECTOR. We can only certify him to jobs over which we have jurisdiction. They are nonagricultural jobs.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Could you certify him to agricultural jobs?

Mr. RECTOR. No; not lawfully.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If he is an agricultural laborer?

Mr. RECTOR. We are not permitted to. The Agricultural Extension Service has taken care of that, Mr. Flannagan.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Then you mean your office cannot find a job for a man on the farm?

Mr. RECTOR. As it is now constituted, that is right.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You can only make recommendations for industrial jobs?

Mr. RECTOR. The best we can do is refer them to the agricultural agent. We cannot refer them directly. We can refer them to the county agents.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Take the case of a worker who comes to your office for work. He is drawing compensation. You know farmers need help. For example, you know that Farmer Jones is badly in need of his services. Do you mean that you cannot refer him to Farmer Jones?

Mr. RECTOR. Illegally I could, and it is done to some extent.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Then you refer him to the Extension Service?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You tell him to go over there for a job, that Farmer Jones needs someone.

Mr. RECTOR. I don't think that practice has ever been followed. What we do is tell a man to go to the county agent.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Let the man see the county agent, and if he does not work take him off the rolls.

Mr. RECTOR. That would put him in this position: If he went to the county agent, he would have to come back to report. You see, these people come back every week if out of work, and we would have to check to find out if he went out to see the farmer and if he was hired; and if not, why not.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Here he is drawing unemployment compensation and you find a job for him. Now if he does not take the job, why not forget the whole matter, and let him lookout for himself.

Mr. RECTOR. That is exactly, Mr. Congressman, what we think should be done. The function of local placement of these benefit claimants should be placed directly under our jurisdiction so that we can do directly just what you are suggesting.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes; I agree with you on that.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will you yield for a question?

I understood you stated that a construction had been placed upon the statutes that would not permit them to recruit farm labor. Now, who placed that construction upon the statute?

Mr. RECTOR. That was the construction that the United States Employment Service had put on their grant from the Federal Government, that they received funds for all employment service functions prescribed under the Wagner-Peyser Act except for the farm placement operation which had been transferred to the United States Department of Agriculture under Executive order, and we are not to spend any of our allocation for farm placement service.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Who in the United States Employment Service puts that construction on the statute?

Mr. RECTOR. I do not know; that is the regulation under which they were operating when we took it over.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Could you secure the information, as to who put that construction on the law?

Mr. RECTOR. I will do my best, sir.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that is pertinent information that should be supplied to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. I think that is information that the committee should have. Perhaps we could get it ourselves from the United States Employment Service.

Mr. RECTOR, if you can get it we would be glad to have you do so and put it in the record. If you cannot get it, we will get it from the United States Employment Service.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. RECTOR, will you answer this question for me? If you had authority to place farm labor, do you think you could take care of the situation in Wisconsin?

Mr. RECTOR. We certainly do, sir.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. You would tell an unemployed, "Here is a job. If you don't want it, you need not come back to see me."

Mr. RECTOR. That is just exactly what we would say and the way we would operate it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Don't you think that would go a long way toward straightening the whole program out?

Mr. RECTOR. I think it would. We think that a lot of the disrepute of the whole unemployment program is due to the fact that these people should be working. They are drawing money and we are not able to step in and administer the program properly by offering them work.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not want to leave my good friend out on a limb. If he has information readily available to give us as to why this is, it is all right for him to furnish it; but I do not think he should come down here to Washington and spend his time trying to get information for the committee. I think we should assume that responsibility ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have that information available?

Mr. RECTOR. No, I do not have it in my files.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to take the responsibility of getting it for the committee?

Mr. RECTOR. I will take the responsibility to do just what I can to run it down.

The CHAIRMAN. We might leave it that way. If you think you cannot do it, then we will get it.

Mr. RECTOR. I think the USES could give it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I think it is unfair to ask this witness to find that information for us. I suggest that we get it ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the best way for the committee to get this information is to have some one from the Department come here. It is important information and the committee can get that information by either having some one from the Department come here or getting it in writing.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Rector, could we say that you would use \$110,000 rather than spend \$200,000? In other words, would you need 27 additional men in order to place farm labor? How much saving would there be over the \$800,000 provided to your State heretofore?

Mr. RECTOR. In talking over the matter with local canners, processors, packers, and the services that they want, we have made studies over some 2 weeks. We think we can perform this program that is now being performed and give all this service for about \$60,000 to about \$75,000, depending on the travel involved; in contrast to the \$225,000 that the job is now costing. We further think there is a hidden saving in the compensation costs that would not have to be paid to such an extent. Those cannot be calculated, but on the Federal budget there will be the saving between \$225,000, what it is now costing in our State extension service, and our estimate of \$75,000.

I have 35 State returns here and the figures vary. The representative figure is about one-third to a half in saving; I mean one-third to one-half of the present expenses of the county agricultural extension systems emergency farm-labor program.

Mr. GATHINGS. That would be saved by giving you the authority to refer these workers on the farm in your State and any other State in the Union?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to know whether or not you would then see that they were thrown off the unemployment compensation rolls if they would not take positions.

Mr. RECTOR. If we found an agricultural worker claiming benefits and that was his job, that he was trained to do agricultural work, if we had an agricultural job and he would not take it, we would throw him off the roll.

Mr. GATHINGS. And then you say 20 percent were drawing compensation at the peak period, which comes when you needed farm labor?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right; and there are the hidden savings. We do not know how much it would amount to for the entire country. You are right, sir.

Mr. PACE. Just to get the matter clear in my own mind: Those funds which are allocated to the Extension Service now are expended in recruiting, which you do not propose to do. Therefore, I do not know that your figures of savings are accurate.

Mr. RECTOR. There is very little if any recruitment in our State with reference to this figure of \$225,000. This is just the local county agent system. The outside recruitment is something else. That is the migratory workers coming up from Texas, if that is what you mean.

Mr. PACE. I mean recruitment within the area.

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; that is recruitment. We had the recruitment in mind when we estimated the \$75,000, Mr. Pace. That is a part of the farm placement program. Part of it is recruitment.

Mr. GRANGER. Then when the farmers' representatives come before this committee and say that they have contacted the employment services and could not get any help from the employment service, the reason is, as you explained, that you could not do it if you wanted to?

Mr. RECTOR. Since the Federal Government took it over in 1942, that is a fact. From 1942 until 1943 the instructions were from Washington to the USES, which then ran the offices in the field through the Federal operations, their instructions were to send all available manpower into industry and the farmers did not like it. Now, when this program was set up to meet that whole situation, it was set up in the spring of 1943, and the Agriculture Department got that function of making farm placements and got the money for it. Since then the Federal agency in the field has had nothing to do with farm placements and when they came to them they just were not able to service them.

Mr. GRANGER. I understood that; but why can intelligent people representing farmers come before this committee and not know that fundamental thing? Haven't they got together so that they would understand the services you could render?

Mr. RECTOR. Well, of course, we haven't had much opportunity. We have had the service back about 2 months, and we have not had much opportunity to work it out with anybody.

Mr. GRANGER. Then presently the farm services have not been of any help in regard to the securing of farm labor. What you actually do, when a person comes in for work, you offer him what you have, which are industrial positions?

Mr. RECTOR. That is right. We can only offer him an industrial position.

Mr. MURRAY. Will you yield for one question? For the record, Mr. Rector, I read your mind; that you have not any doubt whatsoever, so far as the State of Wisconsin is concerned, that you could work out the problem satisfactorily; but, of course, you cannot speak for the whole United States.

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; if it was returned, we would certainly work out the solution to this problem.

Mr. MURRAY. And you know what can be done satisfactorily in our State? You have confidence in our State?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; to that extent we would know he is really working.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rector, what you are saying today, of course, is directed more at permanent legislation which this committee may consider at a later date. Am I correct in that?

Mr. RECTOR. Yes; and it is for this reason that we would dislike to see this bill continue the service at the domestic or local level for another full year. There might be something to be said for another 6 months to the close of this calendar year, and then we could have this other problem worked out on its merits; but if you carry it a full year, we will be where we are next year, in the middle of another crop season.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the gentleman is correct on that.

I think it might be very difficult, assuming the committee would find when it comes to considering permanent legislation that there should be a change made with reference to the agricultural placements; it seems to me it might be very difficult to make that change in the middle of the crop year.

Mr. RECTOR. That is true, sir. The better time to make it would be at the beginning of the calendar year. It would be better to have the change-over or return completed as of December 31, which would be at the end of the growing year.

Mr. Christgau is here and would like to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. We only have 2 minutes but we would be glad to hear him in that time.

**STATEMENT OF VICTOR CHRISTGAU, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF
EMPLOYMENT AND SECURITY, STATE OF MINNESOTA, ST.
PAUL, MINN.**

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Mr. Chairman, I will address myself only to one particular problem. We in Minnesota, prior to the war and before the War Manpower Commission got started, had a State war manpower organization under which we went into this whole business of farm placement and developed all over the State a network of farm placement services. That organization continued only until the War Manpower Commission got going. The pattern established then has since been followed.

Then when the Congress turned the farm placements over to the Department of Agriculture, the law provides that the Department of Agriculture could make arrangements with State organizations under which they would cooperate with them in the farm placement activities. That was done in Minnesota.

The Extension Service in Minnesota entered into an arrangement with the USES to carry on that whole State function, and the two worked together closely without any duplication.

Our recommendation is, if it is continued beyond July 1 of this year, that a provision be made so that as rapidly as the Extension Service can do so, that they liquidate their farm-placement activities, and make arrangements for State employment-security agencies to take over the work. In our State the relationship between the Extension Service and the USES has been one of the fullest cooperation. I am certain, therefore, that arrangements can be made in many States to turn the work back to the State employment service shortly after July 1.

There is another point I want to emphasize, that under existing arrangements, all claimants seeking readjustment allowances, are required to report their unemployment to the State Employment Service offices instead of to the Extension Service. As long as the employment office does not have agricultural jobs listed they are not able to offer them to claimants out of work. You might say, "Why not refer them to the Extension Service?" However, that would involve duplication. The two offices you would have to send reports back and forth between them. The employment office would require

reports from the county agent as to whether or not a claimant took a job; and if he turned it down, the county agent would have to report back why the job was not accepted and then the employment office would have to check on it and make a decision on disallowance of benefits. There would be an unnecessarily large amount of duplication. So the simplest, most economical, and soundest way to do it is what I recommend, that as rapidly as possible the farm placement activities be turned back to the State employment services.

When that is done in our State we will have in every community volunteer or part-time people who will work with the Extension Service in the recruitment and placement of farm workers. Such cooperative arrangements can be worked out elsewhere also. As long as the employment-security agencies pay unemployment compensation and readjustment allowances and are responsible for applying a work test, we believe that it is essential that the same agency that pays out the checks make the job referrals so as to cut off the benefit money when suitable work is refused. The agency paying out the check should be the one to determine whether or not the work was suitable. So I would like to suggest that in the extension of this law that you do make provision for turning it over as rapidly as possible. In some States they can do it July 1 and some they may wish to continue to January 1, 1948.

I would like to explain one more thing: Under the arrangement last year we had the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor making industrial placements, and then again you had the Department of Agriculture making farm placements. There you had two Federal agencies in that same field.

I do not know the exact details of this order that Mr. Rector has mentioned, but it was a sensible order; otherwise you would have had competing Federal agencies with Federal money, both looking around for farm people. Obviously, you would not want one Federal agency to compete with another Federal agency, nor would you want a Federal agency to compete with a State agency. So I assume that what Mr. Rector referred to was that as long as the Extension Service was engaged in farm placements, we did not want to, nor could we, duplicate that service. It was a sensible thing to do; otherwise we would have had duplication which would have resulted in confusion and a waste of money.

Mr. Chairman, that is all that I have to say unless there are some questions.

Mr. ANDRESEN. For the benefit of the new members of the committee, I would like them to get the record straight. I would like to say that Mr. Christgau represented my district in Congress before I was elected. He was a mighty good man.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. I thank you. I think I have had a worthy successor.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very happy to have had you with us today and we appreciate the contribution you have made.

The committee stands adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. (Thereupon, at 11 a. m., the committee adjourned to meet at 10 a. m., Friday, February 7, 1947.)

(The following letters and telegrams were submitted:)

STATEMENT OF JOHN MORRISON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE AGENCY FOR KANSAS, TO THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (80TH CONG.), ON HOUSE RULE NO. 1388

The State of Kansas has for a long period of years operated an employment service. The Kansas Free Employment Bureau originated under the administration of former Gov. Arthur Capper (now United States Senator, and chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee). The chief function of the bureau was to direct and place unemployed workers in agricultural jobs, particularly during the wheat harvest seasons. This was, of course, prior to the advent of combines and modern agricultural equipment and required large numbers of workers to harvest this important crop. This function has been successively carried on through the various changes in name of the agency and represented a large percentage of the placements made by the Employment Service. You will recall that this service was loaned to the Federal Government on January 1, 1942, and that in 1943 the Honorable Paul V. McNutt, then Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, at the direction of the President exercising his war power duties, transferred from the Employment Service to the Agriculture Department the servicing of agriculture and placement of workers in job openings in that field. The United States Department of Agriculture, through the various State extension services, was then required to operate as a placement or job service agency in the agricultural field. This same situation continues today, and House rule 1388 is designed to carry on this function in the Extension Service for an additional 12-month period, beginning with July 1, 1947. I have conferred many times with Dean Umberger, director of the State agricultural extension service, and the county agents working under his supervision. They have on numerous occasions indicated that they did not feel qualified to operate in the placement field nor did they have any desire to do so. In fact, in the first year of operations under the Extension Service, a contract was entered into between the Extension Service and the United States Employment Service for Kansas in which the Employment Service agreed to perform the placement function at a cost to be assessed against the allocation of monies to the Extension Service. In brief, the Agricultural Extension Service in Kansas "farmed out" the job placement function in agriculture to the Employment Service, who performed that duty for less money than the amount allocated to the Extension Service for operations during 1943.

Again, in 1944, the Employment Service was prohibited from carrying out an agreement similar to that existing in 1943 by the regional office of the United States Employment Service. However, the personnel of the Employment Service skilled and experienced in agricultural placements was loaned to the Extension Service, and along with the use of the Employment Service facilities, successfully carried out the function during the year of 1944. No arrangement was made for 1945. However, I am presently negotiating with the Extension Service to contract with them again to do this service in a manner similar to that existing in 1943. I have good reasons to believe that such an arrangement can be agreed to by both agencies. It appears ridiculous, however, to have an appropriation made to one agency of the Federal Government which, in turn, "farms out" the same function to another agency operating with Federal funds and for a less amount of money than originally appropriated in the first instance. The Employment Service in Kansas, consisting of 31 local offices and servicing 90 itinerant points on a weekly basis, is at the present time precluded from soliciting job orders or placing workers in agricultural jobs. This situation results, I am advised, by reason of opinion of the Comptroller General in which he points out that the appropriations for administration of the Employment Service are provided for specific purposes and placement of agricultural workers is excluded. Our offices, being required to recruit and direct workers to industry, are then in direct competition with the Extension Service and the need for farm workers. The unemployment insurance claims handled by the same agency in Kansas are presently at a seasonal peak of 8,000 claims per week against the unemployment compensation fund, and 12,000 claims of ex-servicemen against the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. A great number of these 20,000 unemployed workers are from rural communities and with a work history and background in farming pursuits, making them logical referrals to agricultural jobs. Regardless of the need of the farmers

in these communities for workers, the agency finds itself without authority to refer these workers to jobs and must continue to pay them unemployment benefits, causing an unnecessary drain on the State unemployment-compensation trust fund, as well as on appropriations by Congress to the Veterans' Administration for payment of servicemen's readjustment allowances. In actual practice, when one of these claimants approaches our office for the purpose of filing a claim he is properly registered for work and supplies information for filing a claim. He is then referred to the county agent, a representative of the State extension service, who may not be in the same town, and where he may or may not be referred to a job.

In the event that the county agent has no job opening available, the worker is immediately forgotten insofar as job exposure is concerned and continues to receive benefits over an extended period. In the event that he is referred to a job, we have no way of following up to determine whether or not he refused suitable work with the resultant disqualification for benefits or whether he even reported on the job. In brief, we lack the facilities of supplying the work test which is required of all benefit claimants, veteran and nonveteran. The county agents operating under the Agricultural Extension Service have little or no interest in the placement field. They are primarily fitted for the job of advising and aiding farmers with crop and stock raising, soil conservation, insect control, and the like, a job which keeps them usually well occupied without the additional responsibility of recruiting and supplying workers. On the other hand, the personnel of the Employment Service is specially trained in the field of recruiting and placing of workers in all types of industry. The interviewers and placement men in the rural offices are well acquainted with the agricultural needs of their area. They have immediate access to workers in other areas of the State as well as in adjacent States, and their offices constitute the best possible source of labor. The unemployed worker in search of a job first seeks out the employment office in the community where he should have access to all job openings known to that office. It is my opinion that all available labor in the community should be pooled at the one point, thereby making it available for any job opportunity whether it be industrial or agricultural. The present method of separating agricultural labor from this pool can no more be justified than would be, for example, the separation of the service workers from this pool, and later on other types of workers. It is a well known fact that the workers in small communities are rather versatile and can operate efficiently in nearly all fields of employment when necessary. I therefore urge a modification of House rule 1388, permitting the State employment services to resume placement of agricultural workers at the earliest possible moment. I further suggest a period of liquidation of the farm labor placement function in the Extension Service so as to permit an orderly transfer of this function to the State agencies. Should the committee deem it necessary to grant funds for continuation of this function in the Extension Service beyond July 1, 1947, I should then like to suggest the following amendment, which will permit the States to gradually assume control of an operating agency without interruption of the Service to the public.

AMENDMENT TO H. R. 1388

Not later than December 31, 1947, or on such earlier date, after the enactment of this act, as the Secretary of Labor ascertains, after receiving certification to that effect from the governors of the respective States, that the State Public Employment Office System has made provision for cooperating in the carrying out of an adequate recruitment and placement program for domestic farm labor with such State, the Secretary of Labor shall certify an appropriate transfer request to the Secretary of Agriculture, who shall thereupon transfer the recruitment and placement program for domestic farm labor in the designated State or States to the Department of Labor, for administration in accordance with the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended. In connection with each such transfer, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the Department of Labor for allocation to the State Employment Service so much of the funds appropriated for farm placement and recruitment functions, pursuant to the provisions of this Act, and so much of the fund available from prior appropriations for the same purpose, as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget determines from time to time to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program under the provisions of this Act and the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,
OFFICE OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND PLACEMENT,
Olympia, February 7, 1947.

Farm-Labor Program.

Hon. HAL HOLMES,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLMES: Mr. R. J. Venables has forwarded to me a copy of his telegram to you dated February 4, 1947, relative to bill H. R. 1388.

In view of Mr. Venables' reference to this department in his telegram I would like to clarify the stand of this department with regard to legislation to be enacted for the purpose of providing a farm-placement program by expressing my views as follows:

To avoid confusion of transferring the farm-labor program from one agency to another or changing the provision of the law in the middle of a crop season, and to avoid uncertainty among growers and processors with regard to a full producing and processing season's program, we believe bill H. R. 1388 should provide for the extension of Public Law 229 to December 31, 1947, only, which is a 6 months' extension instead of a 12 months' extension as proposed by bill H. R. 1388.

To give opportunity for necessary advance planning by users of agricultural workers and Government agencies having the responsibility of conducting a farm-labor program, any changes in the law should be made effective on a calendar-year basis instead of a fiscal-year basis because this corresponds more nearly with crop seasons.

In the interest of making available the greatest possible supply of domestic agricultural workers to growers and processors of agricultural products, and in the interest of maintaining maximum job opportunity for unemployed domestic job seekers, including unemployment compensation claimants, we believe permanent farm-labor legislation should place the responsibility of recruitment and placement of domestic agricultural workers with the various State employment services. In order to meet labor deficits requiring the importation of foreign labor the responsibility of recruitment, placement, transportation, and housing of imported foreign workers should rest with the United States Department of Agriculture.

Very truly yours,

JOHN D. DAVIS, *Commissioner.*

P. S.—Identical letter sent to all members of Washington State congressional delegation.

J. D. D.

OHIO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Columbus, Ohio, January 31, 1947.

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
*Member, House Committee on Agriculture,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CLEVENGER: A few days ago Mr. Atkinson received a call from Mr. Charles H. Jones, administrator of the Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation, regarding a bill which had been introduced on January 27 with regard to farm-labor placement.

Our investigation of this matter leads us to believe that the bill which Mr. Jones had in mind was H. R. 1388 (Mr. Hope) which proposes to continue the farm-labor-supply program to June 30, 1948, and which was referred to your committee.

Assuming that this is the bill to which Administrator Jones referred, it may be of interest to you to know that the interstate conference of employment-security agencies (State unemployment compensation administrators), who are now charged with the duty of administering the State job referral activities of the Employment Service, are convinced that this farm-placement activity ought to be integrated into the regular employment-service operations of the several States.

Mr. Jones points out that, through the 95 Ohio employment offices, contact with available farm-labor supply can best be maintained and that the need for a duplicating or separate agency solely devoted to farm-placement work, would lead to confusion and inefficiency. It is also obvious that the important function of policing unemployment-compensation-benefit claims, at a time when many

jobs at a time are going begging, can best be accomplished through a unified employment service which has all available job openings listed with it.

We are passing these comments along to you for your information and would appreciate receiving from your office two or three copies of this proposed legislation, together with any comments or suggestions which you might have regarding its current status and importance.

Respectfully,

PAUL J. DAUGHERTY,
Director, Federal Legislative Affairs Department.

[Telegram]

COLUMBUS, OHIO, February 1, 1947.

Hon. CLIFF CLEVENGER,
Member of Congress:

We are opposed to H. R. 1388 insofar as it would extend the local farm-placement function in the Department of Agriculture beyond close of 1947. We are not opposed to continuation in Department of Agriculture of imported foreign-labor program and transportation, maintenance, etc., of interstate migratory workers. We want returned to the State the farm-placement program now performed by county agents since it should be part of the integrated employment service as it existed prior to take-over by the Federal authorities in 1942. State employment service is set up to perform such functions and can do so more efficiently and economically.

CHARLES J. JONES,
Administrator, Ohio Bureau of Unemployment Compensation.

[Telegram]

CONCORD, N. H., February 3, 1947.

Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
House Office Building:

Hope you will oppose H. R. 1388 insofar as it would extend the local farm-placement program in the Department of Agriculture beyond the close of 1947. Am not opposed to continuation in the Department of Agriculture of imposed foreign-labor program and transportation of interstate migratory workers. We want back in the State employment service the local farm-placement function now performed by county agents.

WILLIAM H. RILEY,
Commissioner of Labor.

[Western Union]

HARRISBURG, PA., February 3, 1947.

Congressman P. B. DAGUE,
House Office Building:

Protest continuation of local farm-placement program in Department of Agriculture as embodied in H. R. 1388. We solicit your help in having this important function returned to the Employment service.

WM. H. CHESTNUT,
Secretary of Labor and Industry.

Hon. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, M. C.,
House of Representatives.

JACKSON, MISS., February 1, 1947.

Re H. R. 1388 urge your opposition to this measure as now written insofar as it would extend the farm placement function in the Department of Agriculture beyond the close of 1947. We are not opposed to continuation in Department of Agriculture of their imported foreign labor program and the transportation, maintenance, etc., of Interstate migratory workers but urge return to employment service of the functions of recruitment and placement of all domestic farm labor both within and between States.

C. B. CAMERON,
*Executive Director,
Mississippi Unemployment Compensation Commission.*

STATE OF IOWA UNEMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION,
Des Moines, Iowa, February 1, 1947.

HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOEVEN: My attention has been called to H. R. 1388, a bill before the Agriculture Committee of the House. I understand this bill provides for the continuation of placement of farm labor by the Agricultural Extension people and that an appropriation is made for that purpose.

Since the return of the employment service to State control it seems to me that it is expedient and also economical to put all placement service in one agency. It is my opinion that this can be done to the advantage of unemployed individuals and also to the farmer who desires to employ help. There might have been some excuse for two placement services during the war because the United States Employment Service was directed specifically to recruit help for war industries and it did neglect everybody else. Now that the war is over it is my opinion that we can through the State employment service render all of the placement functions that are required through the State employment service.

What we want to do is to create in every community a central point where everybody who wants work can register and everyone who desires to hire someone can apply for labor. I see no logical reason why farm placement should be in another agency.

Our commission received a wire that the bill will be before your committee on Tuesday, February 4. In the absence of the other commissioners I am writing my viewpoint in this matter and I feel that it is concurred in by both of the other members of our commission.

Yours very truly,

CLAUDE M. STANLEY,
Commissioner, Iowa Employment Security Commission.

SOUTH CAROLINA EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION,
Columbia, S. C., February 3, 1947.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: Please permit me on behalf of this commission to express our opposition to a further continuance of farm placement functions in the Department of Agriculture. Since its very beginning this plan has failed miserably in this State and in addition is costing the Federal Government millions of dollars a year in servicemen's readjustment allowances and is likewise costing the State hundreds of thousands of dollars a year in unemployment compensation benefits.

As you know nearly half of our people are engaged in agriculture pursuit and when our employment service is prohibited from referring a claimant whose only experience is farm work to work on a farm we are forced to pay him allowances or benefits as the case may be. This further decreases our agriculture labor supply which is already alarmingly short.

We are not opposed to a continuation in the Department of Labor of an imported foreign labor program and transportation, maintenance, etc., of interstate migratory workers but what we want back is the local farm placement functions now supposed to be performed by county agents. Frankly, I have never heard of a placement being made in this State by them.

With personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

JAS. JULIEN BUSH,
Executive Director.

MONTGOMERY, ALA., February 3, 1947.

Congressman GEORGE M. GRANT,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly advocate unfavorable committee action on H. R. 1388 insofar as it relates to continuation of domestic farm placement function in Department of Agriculture. No objection to that Department retaining control of imported foreign farm labor program and transportation, maintenance, etc., of interstate migratory workers, as we never use such labor in Alabama. State employment

services with years of placement experience, both agricultural and industrial, and with coverage and facilities already established, can do a much more effective domestic farm placement job at considerably less cost to the Government than can the Agriculture Department which has neither the coverage, experience, nor, probably, inclination for this type of work. This function ties in directly with the unemployment compensation program and the placement of veterans, 30,000 of whom are registered for employment with the Alabama State Employment Service. None are registered with Agriculture Department.

A large percentage of this group have only a farm background and many are not qualified for or interested in industrial employment. Urgently request that representatives of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies be given opportunity to be heard by the Agricultural Committee. Feel so strongly about this matter and its possible effect on the farmers, workers, and the general public in Alabama that I would like to come or send a representative to Washington to discuss it with you in detail if so doing would serve any purpose. Please call me, collect, in the event there is any additional information you may wish in connection with the background or any other phase of farm placement.

FLEETWOOD CARNLEY,
Director of Industrial Relations.

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo., February 3, 1947.

HON. ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Division of Employment Security considers local farm placement to be an essential function of the State employment service. Forty-one full-time offices and eighty-eight itinerant points now serve as center for employment information and service for nonfarm workers. This same facility with small additional cost could serve farm workers. Transfer between farm and nonfarm employment would be encouraged. Periods of unemployment would be shortened thus conserving State unemployment compensation funds and Federal funds otherwise payable to veterans as readjustment allowances. Division is not opposed to continuation in Department of Agriculture of imported foreign labor program and transportation and maintenance of interstate migratory workers. Effective and efficient placement of farm and nonfarm workers can be best accomplished by centralization in the Missouri State Employment Service.

MICHAEL J. CARROLL,
Director, Division of Employment Security.

DENVER, COLO., February 1, 1947.

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL,
*Representative for Colorado,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

For the following reasons I wish to protest most vehemently any proposed congressional action toward retaining the farm placement function in the Department of Agriculture beyond June 30, 1947; (1) the proposed set-up unnecessarily and expensively duplicates the existing facilities of the State employment services in the agricultural States; (2) the two agencies inevitably will compete for labor which normally works in both agricultural and nonagricultural employment; (3) a complete service to all workers can only be rendered by a single agency charged with the responsibility; (4) the work test for unemployment compensation can only be applied by a single agency having access to all types of jobs and workers; (5) Colorado can perform the farm place function through its employment service at one-third the present cost through the extension service.

I have no objection to retaining in Department of Agriculture responsibility and facilities for importation of foreign labor and for transportation and maintenance of interstate migratory workers; we are solely concerned with relieving county agents of the placement function for which they are neither equipped nor qualified and return it to the agency where it rightfully belongs.

BERNARD E. TEETS,
*Executive Director,
Colorado Department of Employment Security.*

(The following statements were submitted by representatives of the labor unions:)

STATEMENT FILED BY WALTER J. MASON, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, BEFORE THE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, CONSIDERING H. R. 1388, PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 229, AS AMENDED, TO CONTINUE THE IMPORTATION OF FOREIGN FARM LABOR UNDER THE PRESENT FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM WHICH TERMINATES ON JUNE 30, 1947.

The following statement represents the point of view of the American Federation of Labor with respect to H. R. 1388, providing for the continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1948, which is now before this committee for consideration.

This bill appears to be predicated on the assumption that there is a critical shortage of agricultural labor. It is proposed that the only solution to this problem is the importation of foreign farm labor, despite the fact that the existing wage now being paid farm laborers is substandard in the dominant part of the industry.

Too often problems of this type affecting basically the public interest are misconstrued by misleading statements developed in such a form and manner that may cause a misunderstanding of the situation.

Under these circumstances it becomes necessary that I point out the importance of Congress considering all aspects of our economic problem before permitting the importation of foreign labor into this country during peacetime.

The American Federation of Labor is firmly opposed to the enactment of H. R. 1388, or any other bill providing for the importation of foreign labor. Particularly, at a time when unemployment is increasing daily and is now well over the 2,000,000 mark. It is our sincere and considered judgment that it will be a menace to labor in this country and become a serious threat to our entire economy.

THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

The farm labor supply program was originally established in 1943 under Public Law 45, Seventy-seventh Congress.

This act was supplemented by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 299, 78th Cong., title 1), as amended, which permits the entry of native-born agricultural workers from any Western Hemisphere. The act exempts agricultural laborers from (1) payment of head tax; (2) the literacy test; (3) the contract labor provisions; and (4) registration under the provisions of the Alien Act of 1940. They must be in the possession of an identification card, but not required to have a passport or any other entry document. This act was enacted as a wartime measure and terminates on June 30, 1947.

Since 1943 Congress has appropriated over \$100,000,000 to this program. The cost of recruiting, transporting, housing, and guaranteeing of wage to foreign workers for another year would cost in the neighborhood of \$25,000,000 to \$50,000,000. Surely, it is not tenable 2 years after the end of hostilities to spend this additional sum on a wartime emergency problem which no longer exists. Particularly is this true in view of the fact that the major portion of foreign labor recruited under this program is provided for large corporate farmers, beet-sugar industry, and to some extent commercial processors.

The agricultural situation in regard to manpower generated into prominence by the Nation's need for maximizing agricultural production in time of war. This shortage of manpower was caused by thousands of farm laborers leaving the farms to enter military service and to seek more profitable employment in cities or industrial centers to improve their living standards. Although this program affected to some extent the movement of the farm wage rates, it would have undoubtedly improved to greater extent the depressed conditions of the farm laborers in the absence of such a program.

The farm wage rates for the entire country on January 1, 1947, averaged \$4.83 per day without board. Rates per day without board were about \$8 in the Pacific States and averaged less than \$4 in the South. The lowest rates were paid in the east South Central States, where they averaged \$3.28 per day without board (Farm Labor Bulletin January 13, 1947, U. S. Department of Agriculture).

Although the Department of Agriculture maintained that this program has not brought about a reduction in wage rates, there is no assurance that the continuation of this program will not preserve a status quo below the wages that might be obtained by domestic farm labor if normal competition were permitted.

The supporters of this bill are organizations representing large commercialized farm interests of this country. They expect Congress to continue a program which will subsidize large-scale farm operations at the expense of unemployed domestic farm laborers. This would make it possible for them to maintain a substandard wage in this industry through a threat of bringing in foreign laborers.

Although it is certainly true that the program protects the foreign worker as never before, and that in theory foreign labor will not be used to depress farm wages or take jobs from unemployed domestic farm laborers, there still remains several dangerous aspects to the continuation of this program:

(1) Will increase unemployment by reason of the fact that domestic farm labor will drift into cities or industrial areas and there become competitors with labor. Instead of producing on the farm, they are sharing with labor the work that is performed in industry.

(2) All decisions as to availability of domestic workers and as to the prevailing rates are left solely to the Department of Agriculture.

(3) Farmers may come to depend upon the Government to provide a labor supply from abroad and consequently pressure for a permanent program.

It is the opinion of the American Federation of Labor that serious consideration should be given to the possibility of utilizing the funds and provisions of this bill to recruit and furnish domestic labor from depressed rural regions for use in peak seasons in areas of scarce labor supplies.

Data, which has publicly been available throughout the Nation, indicates that large numbers of workers who were recruited from rural areas for defense plant employment have created a labor problem in many metropolitan areas by virtue of their being no jobs to offer them and as a result benefit payments under the employment insurance program have been and are being made. Thousands of them are former farm laborers who would return to the farms if an opportunity is given them to earn a living wage.

Prior to the war, there were definite patterns of migration from areas of labor supply to areas of agricultural labor need. These patterns are principally:

(a) Movement of workers from the extreme southern and of the Atlantic seaboard on a progressive basis in keeping with the crop seasons, northward as far as New York and the lower area of the New England States. Before the war this particular movement ranged from 15,000 to 25,000 workers. At the lowest point during the war this movement dropped to 8,000 or 9,000, and last year, on the basis of information available, and increased almost to the level of the prewar period.

(b) The major migrant area is the Southwest. Prior to the war there were between 30,000 and 50,000 Spanish-Americans who moved northward into the Rocky Mountain beet area, the upper Mississippi Valley, and the Great Lakes area on sugar beet and other crop activity. At the low point during the war this movement had declined to approximately 10,000 workers.

On the basis of data available from the Texas State Labor Department, in 1945 some 32,000 workers were moved by licensed labor recruiters. This does not reflect the self-starting movement, which probably represented an additional 10,000. There will undoubtedly be as many or more available for agricultural employment from this area during the coming year, and while no accurate documentation is available, we understand that considerable movement of migrants have begun to reappear in the Pacific Northwest, and in other areas, in which the prewar migratory pattern was evident.

Furthermore, a telegram received from Maureen Moore, commissioner of the bureau of labor statistics, of Austin, Tex., on February 13, 1947, states:

"In 1945 there were 21,016 farm laborers sent out of Texas; 906 of these were children under 14 years of age. In 1946 there were 32,444 sent out and 2,184 or these were children under 14 years of age. It is the opinion of this department that a like number will be available which is in excess of the normal seasonal migration."

Surely, this information substantiates the fact that sufficient farm labor will be available for the next year without the importation of foreign labor. The truth is, of course, that the shortage of farm labor is an assumption that is unfounded.

In conclusion I again wish to point out that the enactment of this bill may cause a serious effect on the stability of employment in this country. It secures the continuance of depressed conditions in the agricultural industry and threatens our entire economic structure. The American Federation of Labor is prepared to cooperate with this committee in making a thorough investigation of this problem.

STATEMENT OF H. L. MITCHELL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION,
A. F. OF L., ON THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY BILL, H. R. 1388

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you have before you a bill to continue the farm labor supply program up to and including June 30, 1948.

There has been much talk of economy and the prevention of waste and extravagance in government by the Eightieth Congress.

This bill, which would permit the Department of Agriculture to continue importing foreign labor into the United States for exploitation on the large-scale industrialized farms of the Nation, is the most wasteful and extravagant piece of legislation that this Congress may be called upon to consider.

During the war there could be some justification for bringing in workers from Mexico, the British West Indies, and other foreign countries to help out in areas where severe labor shortages existed.

According to a statement made by Gen. Graves B. Erskine, the hero of Iwo Jima, who is now in charge of reemployment and retraining of veterans, over a million American ex-servicemen are now back on the farms and available for such employment as may be offered to them. Surely the Congress of the United States is not going to continue a program that will take jobs away from these ex-servicemen and give them to foreign nationals instead.

The supporters of this bill are the organizations representing the commercialized farm interests of the Nation. They expect Congress to continue a program which will subsidize large-scale farm operations in peacetime. This would make it possible for them to lower farm wages through a threat of bringing in foreign laborers, in the event that the American workers demand fair wages. I submit for the record, copies of minutes and proceedings of several meetings held by a committee representing three major farm organizations and the Agricultural Extension Service, which is known as the Committee for a Permanent Farm Labor Program. You will note that there is a draft of a bill which would set up a system for supplying farm labor and permit the importation of foreign labor on a permanent basis, without regard to quotas and immigration laws. This material has been made public and the resulting publicity may have had something to do with the proposal now before you to just continue the program for 1 year. However, such procedure has been followed consistently since 1943, when the first farm labor supply bill was enacted. A resolution has been adopted each year by the Congress to extend the law for a limited period. There was never an adequate hearing on the measure and I am sure that the Congressmen and Senators never realized that they were voting for a measure which permits foreign workers to take the jobs of American citizens.

The Department of Agriculture's farm labor report for January 1, 1947, shows that there were 25,013 foreign workers still employed in agriculture. These foreign workers should be returned to their homes now and the jobs they are doing should be given to American workers. Last November I was in Phoenix, Ariz., and was told that 2,000 foreign workers from Old Mexico were being brought in to finish harvesting the cotton, fruit, and vegetable crops. I had just left El Paso the day before and I was informed that there were more than 4,000 native Spanish-speaking American citizens, accustomed to doing farm work, who were unemployed in that vicinity. In California I saw hundreds of jalopies loaded with farm workers traveling the highways looking for work. Most of them were native white American citizens. At the same time there were 16,017 Mexican nationals working on farms in California, according to the USDA's Farm Labor Report for November 1, 1946.

I also noted that nearly all of the younger men roaming the highways searching for work, wore the emblem of an ex-serviceman on their coat. I observed attractive green and white signs, throughout the Western States, advertising "Farm Labor Office, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service," and others, inviting itinerant farm workers to apply at the office of the county agent for jobs. I inquired of a number of farm workers as to the type of services they received in those offices; almost without exception they said that it did no good to stop and look for work at those offices. Apparently those offices do keep some record of the number of people who pass through the towns and cities, as they claim hundreds of thousands of farm workers have been placed on jobs.

One of the reasons advanced for enacting H. R. 1388 is the need for field labor on the sugar-beet farms. It is claimed that farm workers have to be imported from Mexico to perform the stoop labor of thinning and harvesting sugar beets. The labor supply for the sugar-beet fields has always come from among the

Spanish-speaking workers of Texas and other Southwestern States. In towns such as San Antonio, Corpus Christi, and El Paso there are thousands of native American workers available for these jobs. There are more of these Spanish-speaking farm workers available than there were before the war, due to the fact that the immigration authorities let down the bars and permitted the illegal entry of Mexican citizens into the Rio Grande Valley. By accepting low wages, the foreign workers have driven many of the native Americans out of the Rio Grande Valley and these Americans have flocked into Texas cities seeking a better opportunity for a livelihood. These American citizens are entitled to the jobs on the sugar-beet farms.

Further, during the war and since, the efficiency of farm operation has increased, especially on the large-scale commercialized farms where 90 percent of the foreign labor we import has been employed. Less labor is now needed and within 10 years we are going to have to transfer at least one-third of the present farm labor supply to other types of industry.

The only purpose this bill will serve is to subsidize a group of wealthy farm operators by having the Department of Agriculture furnish them with labor when they need it, at no cost for the recruitment and transportation of workers to and from their farms. They are heartily in favor of continuing the wartime emergency program for supplying farm labor, because the Government assumes all of the costs and full responsibility for workers supplied to them.

We urge that the committee refuse to recommend this bill, and thus end a small part of the waste and extravagance in the operation of the Federal Government.

×

Feb. 20

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 20, 1947

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to
4 the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public
5 Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),
6 as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-
7 lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section
8 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued for a period not to
9 exceed six months after June 30, 1947: *Provided, That*
10 such program shall be liquidated by December 31, 1947.

1 In order to continue to make available for the purposes
2 of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor
3 camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program,
4 section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
5 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second
6 session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the fol-
7 lowing language: "or until six months after the termination
8 of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolu-
9 tion of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the
10 earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language:
11 "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier". Such
12 amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and
13 liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are here-
14 by authorized to be appropriated.

15 SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

16 (a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Approp-
17 riation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Con-
18 gress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented,
19 and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit
20 or interfere with any of the functions of the United States
21 Employment Service or State public employment services
22 with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as
23 authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

24 (b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of
25 Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure

1 maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension
2 services of the land-grant colleges and the State public
3 employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of
4 domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and
5 information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the
6 proper and efficient administration of the State unemploy-
7 ment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's
8 Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HOPE

FEBRUARY 20, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued February 25, 1947
For actions of February 24, 1947
80th-1st, No. 36

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	6,15	Labor, farm.....	1	Quarantine, animal.....	7,9
Budgeting.....	8,38	Lands.....	29	Research.....	23,33
Corporations.....	8	Lands, reclamation.....	3,12,20,27	Roads.....	13
Daylight saving time.....	2	Lands, grazing.....	9	Social security.....	17
Education.....	21,26,28	Legislative program.....	14	Sugar.....	31
Electrification.....	11,32,37	Livestock and meat.....	7,9	Taxation.....	16
Flood control.....	12,35	Marketing.....	30	Territories & possessions.....	27
Food, inspection.....	22	Monopolies.....	34	Trade, foreign.....	7,9,22,36
Foreign affairs.....	5	Personnel.....	4,21	Transportation.....	9,24
Health.....	18	Prices, control.....	10,19	Veterans' benefits.....	26
Information.....	16			Water, conservation.....	25

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate concurred in House amendment to bill authorizing cooperation with Mexico in combatting foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest. House committee reported bill to provide for 6-months' extension and final liquidation of farm-labor supply program. Senate continued debate on Legislative Budget. Sen. Ferguson asked why Government corporations shouldn't liquidate some of their assets.

HOUSE

1. **FARM LABOR.** The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 2102, to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program (H. Rept. 70)(p. 1460).
2. **DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME.** Rejected, 124-210, H. R. 1700, to provide for daylight saving time in D. C. from May through Sept. of each year (pp. 1422-30).
3. **RECLAMATION.** Received from the Interior Department a report on the Central Valley Project (H. Doc. 146). To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1460.)
4. **PERSONNEL CEILINGS.** Received the Budget Bureau's report on personnel ceilings for the quarter ended Dec. 31, 1946 (p. 1460).
5. **FOREIGN RELATIONS.** Rep. O'Konski, Wis., criticized the handling of Argentine relations and commended the contribution of Argentina to the world's food supply (pp. 1452-60).
6. **ADJOURNED** until Wed., Feb. 26 (p. 1460).

SENATE

7. **ANIMAL DISEASES.** Concurred in the House amendment to S. 568, to authorize cooperation with Mexico in combatting foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest (pp. 1398-1400). This bill will now be sent to the President.

Received a Mont. Legislature memorial urging the strengthening of sanitary requirements, patrols, and quarantines on our borders to guard against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease; and assistance to Mexico in suppressing the outbreak of that disease there (p. 1378).

Sen. Canner, Kans., inserted resolutions of the National Livestock Assoc., favoring efforts on the part of the Federal government to eradicate the foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico and prevent its introduction into the U.S. (p. 1380).

8. LEGISLATIVE BUDGET. Continued debate on S. Con. Res. 7, the Legislative Budget which provides for a \$6,000,000,000 cut in the President's expenditure estimates. Tabled a motion by Sen. Murray, Mont., that consideration of the resolution be postponed until Apr. 1, 1947 (p. 1406), and one by Sen. Pepper, Fla.; to defer the resolution until Apr. 2, 1947. (pp. 1406-15).

Sen. Ferguson, Mich., criticized the making of "appropriations" to Government corporations, asked "why should we not compel them to start to liquidate some of the assets which they are accumulating," and inserted a list of the amounts budgeted for the corporations for administrative expenses (pp. 1386-8).

9. LIVESTOCK AND MEAT. Sen. Canner, Kans., inserted resolutions of the National Livestock Assoc. opposing new reciprocal trade agreements and the reduction of tariffs; and urging uniformity in interstate sanitary regulations; a study by this Department to determine the number of additional stockyards which may be posted under the Packers and Stockyards Act, the passage of legislation amending the transportation-rate structure, that the Secretary instruct the Forest Service not to cut livestock permits; that breeding-herd preference shall not be reduced, and a survey of forest lands and the transfer of lands chiefly valuable for grazing to the Grazing Service (pp. 1380-1).

10. PRICE CONTROL. Sen. Wherry, Nebr., inserted a Times-Herald editorial claiming that prices have not risen unreasonably since controls were removed (p. 1384).

11. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Magnuson, Wash., inserted a Wash. Legislature memorial opposing increases in the wholesale power rates for electric energy generated at Federal projects on the Columbia River (p. 1379).

12. RECLAMATION; FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Gurney, S. Dak., inserted a S. Dak. Legislature resolution requesting appropriations to carry out proposed reclamation and flood-control projects in that State (p. 1379).

13. ROADS. Received from the Federal Works Agency statistical information on the operations of the Public Roads Administration (p. 1377).

14. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Taft, Ohio, announced that the Senate would begin holding night sessions on Mondays and Wednesdays, beginning March 10 (p. 1389).

5. RECESSED until Wed., Feb. 26 (p. 1415).

BILLS INTRODUCED

16. TAXATION. S. 684, by Sen. Baldwin, Conn., to provide for exemption from the admissions tax for admissions to agricultural fairs which are conducted with financial aid from States or political subdivisions thereof. To Finance Committee. (p. 1383.)

17. SOCIAL SECURITY. S. 681, by Sen. Magnuson, Wash., to be known as the General Welfare Act or General Welfare Act amendments to the Social Security Act, so as to extend coverage thereunder to all groups and all classes, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide the revenue for an all-inclusive system

peated his oft-stated intention of never violating Uruguayan independence. Brazil and Argentina carried on a surreptitious flirtation for many months. *O Journal of Rio* under date of July 28, 1944, praised in effusive terms the peace and good relations with Argentina. The same paper in two striking editorials spoke in undeniably cordial terms of the need for rapprochement with Argentina. Later in the year a delegation of Brazilian newspapermen, invited officially by the Argentine Government, visited Buenos Aires. They were from Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, and Uruguayana on the Argentine-Brazilian frontier—evidence perhaps that Argentina was not on the verge of pulling a Sudeten irredentist stunt on the unsuspecting Brazilians. This delegation provoked an outburst of camaraderie from the Argentine press and Government. The delegation presented the Argentine President with an Argentine flag, made and embroidered in Brazil. A trivial incident, perhaps? But tremendously significant as an indication of the way the wind blows.

Argentine-Chilean relations in the economic field have boomed and flourished. In August of 1944, the Instituto de Economía de Chile, a government organization, urged the development of a wide program of importation of Argentine meats. This did not smack of economic sanctions. *La Nación*, of Buenos Aires, in an editorial of August 5, 1944, expressed satisfaction in the increasing economic ties with Chile and pointed out the extraordinary welcome given Argentine capital in the copper and iron mines of the neighboring country. It would be impossible to cite, within the scope of this article, the numerous expressions of the Latin-American press favorable to Argentina. In Mexico City, where official statements and the press generally have not gone overboard for Argentina, one of the most distinguished and independent of Mexican writers, Salvador Noro, who could not conceivably be accused of fascism, fifth columnism, or falangism, wrote in his column in *Novedades*—September 30 and October 10, 1944—regarding Argentina. He noted the growing downward trend in the good-neighbor policy and spoke of Secretary Hull as "deplorably and irritably violent with reference to Argentina." If one reflects on the fact that the Mexican press is extremely hesitant to make even the slightest criticism of this Nation's foreign policy, the importance of these comments is even more striking.

We turn to the British reaction. Here, I suspect, is the essence of the whole question. How did British opinion react to the American policy? The British press was full of comment and most of it never reached the American reader. Some of it was nothing short of startling and ought to be known in this country. The general trend was to fight shy of any anti-Argentina commitments for two basic reasons: British capital investment in that republic, and British consumption of Argentine food, without which the population of the United Kingdom would have been, to put it very mildly, in an extremely tight spot.

The British press and responsible journals look at the question candidly and concluded that it was best to let it alone. The idea of sanctions certainly aroused no glee on the other side of the water. In a wire to the *New York Times* from London, dated July 28, 1944, it was stated that—

The suggestions made by some correspondents in Washington that Great Britain might apply economic sanctions are considered with incredulity in London financial and trade circles.

The *Sunday Observer*, in July 1944, noted that—

Great Britain should be prudent in the matter of sanctions since it depends much more on the Argentine than does the United States.

The *Southampton Journal*, of August 5, 1944, spoke out quite frankly:

If the United States Department of State had wished to fortify the position of the Argentine Government, its accusations could not have been better timed. It is hard to see Washington's intentions. From the Argentine point of view, the basic question is the respect for national sovereignty and the right of a people to decide freely its own conduct. This is one of the principles which has determined entrance into this war.

The *Economist* of London, in August 1944, spoke out:

The United States and England are mutually suspicious of each other. England suspects imperialism; the United States suspects exclusion from the Argentine market.

The same journal extended its comments further:

The simplest arguments against sanctions is that they would fortify Farrell. Moreover, an economic war would cause more harm to the United Nations than to Argentina. Argentine hides and meat, without mentioning other articles, are vital to Great Britain. It is doubtful that restrictions would bring Argentina to her knees, since she has reserves and can wait until the not distant end of the war in Europe, when the hungry nations of the ravished continent will look to her ample stocks of food.

The pungency and potency of this argument can escape no one. This sedate journal concluded by saying that—

The United Nations should not single out Argentina when economic war has not been waged on Sweden, Switzerland, Portugal, Ireland, or Turkey. Great Britain is no longer in a position to break carelessly with Argentina.

The number of quotations could be multiplied ad infinitum. It is plain that the British press did not consider that the application of economic sanctions would immediately produce the exit of the Fascists from office.

The *New York Post* editorialized on July 28, 1944, that "if we cease business with Argentina we seal the destiny of the Farrell regime and provoke its downfall. The Argentine people in their disillusionment will expel the Fascists." This is far from the truth. We could cut off every bit of commerce with Argentina; we could clamp down every sanction about which we have any knowledge; we could exclude every dollar from flowing to Buenos Aires, and the net result would not be strangulation. We do not dominate the economy of Argentina.

We cannot take measures of a drastic kind which would prove effective unless we actually blockade Argentine waters and cut off her shipping with the rest of the world. We cannot actually force Argentina to make a change, short of war. And certainly no American in his right mind contemplates such an alternative.

If one analyzes the structure of Argentine economy it is clear that if sanctions were to be effective they will have to be applied by a group of about nine powers, the combination of which under the present circumstances is just about impossible. These states are Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, Bolivia, and Chile in South America, with the United States, Great Britain, Spain, and Sweden outside South America.

A brief table on the status of Argentine foreign trade will illustrate the point graphically:

EXPORTS (Millions of pesos)					
Period	British Empire	United States	Brazil	Other American countries	Sweden
1937-39...	577	221	86	62	30
1941.....	553	562	83	138	16
1942.....	689	492	102	220	72
1943.....	894	498	138	323	60

IMPORTS					
Period	British Empire	United States	Brazil	Other American countries	Sweden
1937-39...	371	284	51	90	27
1941.....	314	370	123	169	22
1942.....	264	329	160	142	81
1943.....	222	150	169	123	83

These figures speak for themselves. They show the tremendous exports to the United Kingdom in a steady increase between 1937 and 1943. They show a goodly increase of exports to the United States which are much heavier than the imports. The proponents of sanctions would have to explain just how they are going to hurt Argentina by cutting off trade when in 1943, the United States imported 498,000,000 pesos of Argentine products and Argentina imported exactly 150,000,000 pesos of American goods. Notice, too, the increase in trade to Brazil and the other American republics; from 62,000,000 in the case of the latter in 1937-39, to 323,000,000 in 1943. The figures for imports show an equally healthy increase.

Let us reflect on the fact that Argentina held in 1944 a favorable balance of nearly 400,000,000 pesos with Great Britain and then speculate on how far the British were willing to go in putting on the screws. Argentina has become more and more industrialized and has found it possible to curtail substantially her imports of manufactured products. For example, the country imported 146,000 tons of textiles in 1939, while in 1943 the amount was 63,000 tons. Iron products in the same 2 years dropped from 693,000 tons to 76,000. Rubber goods from 14,000 to 1,000. The production figures on industry show that between 1935 and 1943, Argentine manufacturing increased over a hundred percent. The total production figures for 1935, in millions of pesos was 3,330 while in 1943 it

had increased to 7,800. To show how important this industrial activity became, one may contrast it with the production in agriculture and cattle raising, which in 1943 were 1,600 and 1,750, respectively. All this adds up to one thing: that Argentina made vast strides in self-sufficiency during the years since the commencement of the war in Europe and that there can be no question of starving into submission the 15,000,000 Argentine citizens.

The story of agitated and tightened Argentine-American relations does not end with the close of 1944. Recognition came reluctantly after that. Accusations of Nazi influence continued, culminating in the Blue Book. General Perón became the favored target of attack and diatribe. The United States showed up badly in the long run. The examination of the Argentine case is indispensable if the full story of inter-American relations is to be understood. Aside from all that has been said regarding the conduct of the Farrell regime and what could be said regarding Perón and the new government, there is still the highly important question of whether this policy of pressure and frontal attack produced the results that were planned. We could assume, for the sake of argument, that the Argentine government in the past few years has been every bit as bad as it has been depicted; the fact remains that nothing that we tried produced the result that we professed to achieve. It is not merely a question of fact, but of tactics and techniques. The story of what happened since the revolution of June 1943 can lead only to one conclusion: that somehow, in some form, we have set inter-American relations back a long, long time.

I wish to extend to Richard Pattee, and the University Press, Notre Dame, Ind., credit and thanks for supplying me the material for this insertion.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to operate vessels until July 1, 1947; and

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution granting, in the case of income, estate, and gift taxes, deductions for contributions to the United Nations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(Tuesday, February 25, 1947)

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, to hold hearings on House Joint Resolution 134, providing for relief assistance to countries devastated by war. The meeting will be held in the Foreign Affairs Committee room, gallery floor, the Capitol.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Tuesday, February 25, 1947)

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Federal Communications Commission pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

(Tuesday, February 25, to Friday, February 28, 1947)

The Committee on Education and Labor will continue hearings on bills to amend, revise, repeal, or modify the National Labor Relations Act in the caucus room, third floor, Old House Office Building, at 10 a. m. each morning.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

(Tuesday, February 25, 1947)

There will be a meeting of the full Committee on Armed Services at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in room 313, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

(Tuesday, February 25, 1947)

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs will meet at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in executive session, in the committee room, suite 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(Tuesday, February 25, 1947)

The Committee on Banking and Currency will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, February 25, 1947, in the committee room, 1301 New House Office Building, to consider the matter of the disposition of permanent war housing under the Lanham Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of February 21, 1947]

387. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting certain sta-

tistical information relative to the operations of the Public Roads Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

[Submitted February 24, 1947]

388. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fifth annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Public Lands.

389. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed loan of certain captured enemy ordnance and equipment to the Navy Club of the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

390. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to authorize certain persons assigned by the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations to be reappointed to the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

391. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, stating that section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858), authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to reserve from all appropriations lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects, and that no reservations pursuant to section 13 of this act were made during the calendar year of 1946; to the Committee on Public Lands.

392. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games; to the Committee on Armed Services.

393. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ending December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

394. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report presented to Secretary Krug by the Bureau of Reclamation of this Department on August 6, 1946, on the Central Valley Federal reclamation project in California (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide that any service rendered and any deductions made or taxes paid by any person under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, any other Federal retirement act, or the So-

FARM SUPPLY PROGRAM

FEBRUARY 24, 1947.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 2102]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm labor-supply program, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

STATEMENT

The hearings held by this committee were based on H. R. 1388. Several amendments were adopted and H. R. 2102 was thereupon introduced as a clean bill incorporating these amendments.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the farm labor-supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title 1), as amended and supplemented, to be continued for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947, and directs that such program be liquidated by December 31, 1947. It also authorizes to be made available until December 31, 1947, all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and other facilities heretofore available under this program by amending section 2 (d) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), and extending the date for the liquidation of such centers, homes, camps, and other facilities until December 31, 1947.

The farm labor program has provided much needed labor for the planting, cultivating, harvesting, and processing of food crops vitally needed for domestic consumption and export. According to testimony presented at the hearings on this bill, sufficient labor of the kind required by producers and processors of agricultural commodities is not available, and according to recent surveys made by the Department of Agriculture and the State Extension Services, an adequate

supply of farm labor will not be available throughout the remainder of this year unless the labor-supply program is continued.

The need for farm labor is particularly acute in connection with the production of sugar beets, fruits, vegetables, and canning crops. The labor requirements in connection with the production of many of these crops are largely seasonal, and the laborers are needed in particular areas for only short periods of time. The laborers must, therefore, be organized in such a manner as to facilitate their movement on into other areas as the season progresses.

Processors and producers are at present negotiating contracts with respect to sugar and canning crops for 1947. Negotiations must also be carried on with foreign governments so that the necessary foreign labor may be obtained as it is needed. Unless farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities are soon given assurance that a sufficient supply of labor will be available to plant, harvest, and process their crops, production of vital agricultural commodities such as sugar beets and sugarcane is likely to be curtailed.

It is the view of the committee that the present emergency farm-labor-supply program should be concluded by December 31, 1947, and that consideration should be given to the need for the development and establishment of a permanent program for the recruitment and placement of farm labor. Accordingly, the Secretary of Agriculture is, under H. R. 2102, directed to liquidate the present emergency farm labor program by December 31, 1947. In order to assure an orderly termination of the program and at the same time make maximum use of such program in obtaining labor throughout the remainder of the year, no date has been specified when the liquidation process is to commence. It is contemplated, however, that liquidation will start as soon as the labor is no longer needed and, in any event, soon enough to permit a complete liquidation of the program by the end of the year, including the return of all foreign workers to their native countries.

To remove any uncertainty as to the continuation of the exemptions from immigration laws and regulations accorded foreign farm workers under section 5 (g) of Public Law 229, the accompanying bill authorizes the extension of such exemptions during the continuation of the program. This continued authority is necessary, because, under the provisions of existing law, the authority for such exemptions terminated with the cessation of hostilities.

Section 2 of the bill is designed to make certain that the emergency farm-labor program as extended by the accompanying bill does not limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or the State public employment services, with respect to the maintenance of a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

During the course of the hearings, it was pointed out that the farm placement service of the United States Employment Service and the State public employment services, authorized under the act of June 6, 1933, was no longer being maintained because the United States Employment Service administratively concluded that funds appropriated for that purpose could no longer be used to maintain a farm placement service as long as the emergency farm labor program was in effect. Testimony was also presented to the effect that the dis-

continuance of the farm placement service of the State public employment agencies and the lack of coordination of the emergency farm labor program of the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges with the State public employment and security offices have made it possible for qualified farm workers to obtain unemployment compensation or servicemen's readjustment allowances, notwithstanding the fact that suitable farm employment was available. Section 2 of the bill is intended to correct this situation by removing such limitations upon the functioning of the State public employment offices as may exist by virtue of the emergency farm labor program, and by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor to take such action as may be necessary to assure full cooperation between the agricultural extension services and the State public employment agencies, to the end that qualified farm workers may be placed in suitable farm employment if it is available, thereby reducing the number of claimants for unemployment compensation.

The following letter from the Secretary of Agriculture recommends the continuation of the emergency farm labor program:

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1947, for a report on H. R. 1388, a bill "to provide for continuance of the farm labor-supply program up to and including June 30, 1948." The bill authorizes the appropriation of "such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance of such program as provided in this act."

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply programs have been provided to June 30, 1947, through—

Public Law 45, Seventh-eighth Congress, first session—\$26,100,000 for 8 months of 1943;

Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$30,000,000 for calendar year 1944;

Public Law 529, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$20,000,000 for calendar year 1945;

Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session—\$25,000,000 for calendar year 1946; and

Public Law 521, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session—\$12,000,000 to June 30, 1947.

Favorable action on H. R. 1388 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm-labor-supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurance at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946, and the type of labor brought in under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the supply of agricultural workers available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

Extension of the authority for the farm-labor program, contained in Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented, during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1948 will make possible continuation of the farm-labor-supply program during the winter harvest season in certain Southern and Southwestern States. It also provides ample time for the Congress to consider whether any farm-labor program is needed in the postwar years, for the orderly transition from emergency to peacetime activities, and the liquidation of the program during the last 6 months of the 1948 fiscal year.

In extending the program it is necessary that existing facilities continue to be provided for proper housing and feeding of agricultural workers. Those facilities have been made available through permanent and mobile camps. Such facilities are subject to liquidation commencing July 1, 1947, as provided in Public Law

731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. In order that the necessary housing will be available through the extended period, the amendment to section 2 (d), Public Law 731, as provided in H. R. 1388 is necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2 (a) of rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1946

SEC. 2. * * *

(d) All labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities formerly under the supervision or administration of the Farm Security Administration and originally transferred or made available to the War Food Administrator for use in the farm labor supply program pursuant to Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 70), and all similar labor centers, homes, camps, and facilities constructed or acquired by the War Food Administrator or the Department of Agriculture pursuant to subsequent similar laws or otherwise, shall be liquidated as provided in this Act and the proceeds paid to the Treasurer of the United States as each such center, home, camp, or facility is no longer needed in the farm labor supply program originally initiated pursuant to Public Law 45, [or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress, or by the President, whichever is the earlier] *or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier.*



80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

[Report No. 70]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 20, 1947

Mr. HOPE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

FEBRUARY 24, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to
4 the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public
5 Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),
6 as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-
7 lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section
8 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued for a period not to
9 exceed six months after June 30, 1947: *Provided, That*
10 such program shall be liquidated by December 31, 1947.
11 In order to continue to make available for the purposes

1 of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor
2 camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program,
3 section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
4 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second
5 session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the fol-
6 lowing language: "or until six months after the termination
7 of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolu-
8 tion of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the
9 earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language:
10 "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier". Such
11 amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and
12 liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are here-
13 by authorized to be appropriated.

14 SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

15 (a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appro-
16 priation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Con-
17 gress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented,
18 and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit
19 or interfere with any of the functions of the United States
20 Employment Service or State public employment services
21 with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as
22 authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

23 (b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of

1 Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure
2 maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension
3 services of the land-grant colleges and the State public
4 employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of
5 domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and
6 information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the
7 proper and efficient administration of the State unemploy-
8 ment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's
9 Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

80TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 2102

[Report No. 70]

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Hope

FEBRUARY 20, 1947

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

FEBRUARY 24, 1947

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 724

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 26 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Mr. CAPPER introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to
4 the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public
5 Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),
6 as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-
7 lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section
8 5 (g) of such Act, shall be continued up to and including
9 December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within
10 ninety days. In order to continue to make available for the

1 purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor
2 homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this
3 program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administra-
4 tion Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress,
5 second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom
6 the following language: "or until six months after the
7 termination of the present hostilities as determined by con-
8 current resolution of the Congress or by the President,
9 whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the
10 following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is
11 the earlier". Such amounts as may be necessary for the
12 continuance and liquidation of such program as provided
13 in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

14 SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act the Secretary
15 of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such
16 action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation
17 between the agricultural extension services of the land-
18 grant colleges and the State public employment agencies
19 in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor
20 and in the keeping of such records and information with
21 respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and
22 efficient administration of the State unemployment compen-
23 sation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjust-
24 ment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

A BILL

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CAPPER

FEBRUARY 26 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

DIGEST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued March 4, 1947
For actions of March 3, 1947
80th-1st, No. 40

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....13	Foreign affairs.....21	Personnel.....6,27
Appropriations.....1,2,20	Forests and forestry.....11	Property, surplus.....1
Budgeting.....1,20,38	Fruits and vegetables.....17	Records, disposition of.....30
Cost-of-living.....39	Grain.....9,15,32	Research.....8,22,34
Debt, public.....20	Labor, farm.....14	School-lunch program.....16,
Drugs.....19	Lands.....28	16,36
Electrification, rural.....33	Lands, reclamation.....10,23,	Selective service.....24
Expenditures.....40	26,31	Subsidies.....4
Federal aid.....4	Law enforcement.....5	Trade, foreign.....7
Flag.....29	Livestock and meat.....15	Transportation.....3,18
Food, prices.....15	Marketing.....8,22,34	Wildlife.....37
Food, production.....15	Payments in lieu of taxes.....11,35	Wool.....12

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to Legislative Budget with \$4,500,000,000 cut. Sen. Lodge spoke for his bill to establish Commission on Organization of Executive Branch. House Rules Committee cleared bill to provide for 6-months' continuation and liquidation of farm-labor supply program. Byrd Committee submitted report on Federal subsidies and grants-in-aid to States. Rep. Murray criticized USDA request for lower production of wheat, hogs, and beef and claimed Department should share responsibility for farm prices. Sen. McCarran introduced bill to provide 1947 funds for school-lunch program.

SENATE

1. **LEGISLATIVE BUDGET.** Agreed, 64-20, to S. Con. Res. 7, the Legislative Budget, with amendments (pp. 1639-53). Sens. Bridges, Millikin, Taft, Gurney, Brooks, Butler, McKellar, George, Barkley, and Hayden were appointed Senate conferees (p. 1653). The Tydings amendment, agreed to Feb. 28, was to strike out the provision in the Wherry amendment which would permit surplus-property receipts to be included in the \$2.6 billion savings. As finally agreed to by the Senate, the concurrent resolution reads as follows:

"Resolved, etc., That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon presently available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1948 will approximate \$39,100,000,000 and that expenditures during such fiscal year should not exceed \$33,000,000,000, of which latter amount not more than \$25,100,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereafter made available for obligation in such fiscal year. It is the further judgment of the Congress that sound fiscal policy requires that not less than \$2,600,000,000 of the excess of revenues over expenditures be applied toward reduction of the public debt during said fiscal year. It is further declared to be the judgment of the Congress that all proceeds from the transfer or disposition of property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, which are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts should be applied toward reduction of the public debt."

During debate on the Legislative Budget, Sen. Lodge, Mass., spoke in support of S. 164, for establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (pp. 1640-2).

2. APPROPRIATIONS. In reporting H. R. 1968, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill (see Digest 29), the Appropriations Committee struck out the rescission of \$9,000,000 for OPA and provided an additional appropriation of \$7,991,815, with the following provision: "...it is the intent of the Congress that all funds heretofore and herein appropriated shall be used to defray all expenses incident to the closing and liquidation of the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Temporary Controls by June 30, 1947." Provision was also made that the Civilian Production Administration "shall be discontinued and its affairs shall be entirely liquidated not later than June 30, 1947." There was no change in the rescissions for this Department.
3. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 110, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers (S. Rept. 44) (p. 1656).
4. SUBSIDIES; FEDERAL AID. Received the report of the Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal subsidies and grants-in-aid to the States (S. Doc. 13) (pp. 1656-7).
5. LAW ENFORCEMENT. Passed as reported S. 487, to make actions on Federal lands subject to State law if no Federal law covers the matter (p. 1667).
6. PERSONNEL. Passed as reported S. 459, to prohibit discrimination against physically handicapped persons in Federal employment, etc. (p. 1669).
7. EXPORT CONTROL. Sen. Butler, Nebr., criticized control of the exportation of hides (pp. 1670-1).
8. RESEARCH; MARKETING. Both Houses received an Oreg. Legislature memorial urging provision of funds to carry out the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (pp. 1653, 1698).
9. WHEAT BONUS. Received a N. Dak. Legislature resolution favoring provision of funds for the payment of a 30-cent per bushel bonus on all wheat produced in 1945 (p. 1655).
10. RECLAMATION. Both Houses received Wyo. Legislature memorials favoring Bureau of Reclamation supervision over Federal irrigation projects in Wyo., and urging the development of the Colorado River in the Upper Basin States (pp. 1654, 1698).
11. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES. Both Houses received an Oreg. Legislature memorial urging a system of payments in lieu of taxes based on fair value of national-forest lands and other U.S. real property (pp. 1653-4, 1698).
12. WOOL. Both Houses received an Idaho Legislature memorial favoring extension of CCC purchase program to cover the entire 1947 domestic wool clip and provision for a long-range price stabilization plan for domestic wool (pp. 1656, 1698).
13. RECESSED until Wed., Mar. 5 (p. 1677).

HOUSE

14. FARM LABOR. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H.R. 2102, to provide for a 6-months' extension and final liquidation of the

farm labor supply program (p. 1680). This bill was later passed over without prejudice on the consent calendar because of the earlier action by the Rules Committee (p. 1687).

15. FOOD PRODUCTION; FOOD PRICES. Rep. Murray, Wis., criticized the Department's requests for lower production of wheat, hogs, and beef, and claimed that USDA should share the responsibility for agricultural prices (pp. 1678-9).
16. SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM. Rep. Preston, Ga., urged that funds be made available for the continuation of this program (p. 1680).
17. POTATOES. Rep. Shafer, Mich., announced that Mar. 3 was Potato Day on Capitol Hill and gave some figures on the use of potatoes in the making of potato chips (p. 1678).
18. TRANSPORTATION. Agreed to Senate amendments to H.J.Res. 122, to authorize the Maritime Commission to provide for ocean transportation to Alaska (p. 1682). This measure will now be sent to the President.
19. DRUGS. Passed without amendment H.R. 2045, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin (p. 1688).
20. LEGISLATIVE BUDGET. Rep. Dirksen, Ill., stated that the action of the Senate in reducing the budget out to \$4,500,000,000 "is a curious piece of business," and urged reductions in Federal spending (p. 1679). Reps. Monroney (Okla.) and Rich (Pa.) urged reduction of the public debt (pp. 1680, 1681).
21. FOREIGN RELIEF. Rep. Buffett, Nebr., advocated that "...this House and the people have a full and genuine opportunity to discuss and appraise the merits and demerits..." of the proposed financial aid to Greece (p. 1681).
Rep. Hoffman, Mich., criticized some of the methods of distribution and the uses of funds made available by the U.S. for relief in Europe (pp. 1690-1).
22. RESEARCH; MARKETING. Received an Idaho Legislature memorial urging provision of funds to carry out the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (p. 1698).
23. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment S.J.Res. 60, to authorize the San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District, Ariz., to drill, equip, and acquire wells for use of the San Carlos irrigation project (pp. 1655-6).
24. SELECTIVE SERVICE. Both Houses received from the President his recommendation that no extension of selective service be made at this time (H. Doc. 162). To Armed Services Committees. (pp. 1658, 1682.) The present Act expires Mar. 31, 1947.

HOUSE

25. SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM. S. 761, by Sen. McCarran, Nev., to provide additional funds for the fiscal year 1947 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act. To Appropriations Committee. (p. 1657.)
26. RECLAMATION. S. 753, by Sen. Ecton, Mont., to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian Irrigation project. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1657.)

27. PERSONNEL. S. 760, by Sen. Gurney, S.Dak.(by request), to grant to members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps who are Government employees the same rights to leave of absence from the civilian duties when ordered to military duty for not more than 15 days as are now enjoyed by members of the Officers' Reserve Corps. To Armed Services Committee. (p. 1657.)
H.R. 2333, by Rep. Howell, Ill., declaring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a legal holiday. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 1697.)
28. LAND TAXATION. H.R. 2341, by Rep. Cole, N.Y., to amend the act of August 29, 1916, so as to require the lessee of certain public property to pay State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxes thereon. To Armed Services Committee. (p. 1697.)
29. FLAG. H.R. 2342, by Rep. Kilday, Tex., to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the U.S. flag. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 1697.)
30. GOVERNMENT RECORDS. H.R. 2332, by Rep. Celler, N.Y., to prohibit the appropriation for unofficial purposes of certain documents by officers or former officers of the U.S. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 1697.) Remarks of author(p.1680).
31. RECLAMATION. H.R. 2334, by Rep. Miller, Calif., to authorize the American River development as an integrated feature of the Central Valley project, Calif., for irrigation and reclamation and other purposes. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1697.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

32. WHEAT BONUS. Rep. Robertson, N.Dak., inserted a N.Dak. Legislature resolution favoring Federal payment of a 30-cent per bushel wheat bonus on all wheat produced during 1945 (p. A846).
33. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Andresen, Minn., inserted a Minn. Legislature resolution urging provision of funds for the expansion of rural electrification programs (p. A847).
34. RESEARCH; MARKETING. Rep. Angell, Oreg., inserted an Oreg. Legislature memorial urging appropriation of funds authorized by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (p. A860).
35. PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES. Rep. Angell, Oreg., inserted an Oreg. Legislature memorial favoring payments in lieu of taxes based on fair value of national forest lands and other U.S. real property (p. A863).
36. SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM. Rep. Forand, R.I., inserted a Warwick (R.I.) City Council resolution protesting the withholding of Federal funds for the school-lunch program (pp. A867-8).
37. WILDLIFE. Rep. McMillan, S.C., inserted his speech before the State Wildlife Bureau at Florence, S.C., in which he discussed the need for wildlife preservation (pp. A854-5).
38. BUDGETING. Rep. Mason, Ill., inserted Mr. Pettengill's (former Member of the House) radio address, "Shall We Save \$6,000,000,000" (pp. A865-6).
Rep. VanZandt, Pa., inserted a Washington Post editorial, "Battle of the Budget (p. A849).
39. COST-OF-LIVING. Extension of remarks of Rep. Buffett, Nebr., on the causes for

Now is the appropriate time to see what the left hand is doing as well as the right hand.

The Department of Agriculture must assume its part of the responsibility for the agriculture prices. The Department January 14, 1947, press release asked the American wheat producer to plant over a million acres less wheat in 1947 than 1946. The Department of Agriculture on January 14, 1947, asked the American hog producer to reduce the number of brood sows. The Department has recently asked for a reduction of beef cattle on United States farms. The Department of Agriculture has, on January 14, 1947, asked for an increase of over 400,000,000 pounds in United States milk production, even though last week they put a floor price of 10 cents per pound on powdered skim—4½ cents less per pound than the OPA ceiling. The fact that powdered skim with its 35 percent digestible protein has had only a 10-cent per pound support, indicates that our Agriculture Administration may find itself giving the American consumer dairy prices comparable to the 30-cent pork prices.

The old witch, Mrs. Scarcity, has been seen by so many for so long by the Department of Agriculture that the Department appears incapable of providing a constructive food program.

Anyone trying to deceive the American people into believing that the death of OPA has determined or will determine wheat and pork prices can well obtain the facts before they become too deeply involved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution passed by the North Dakota Legislative Assembly.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

GOVERNMENT OF GREECE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports over the week end the State Department has agreed in principle to help Great Britain carry the burden of maintaining the present government in Greece. It is reported that the total financial aid under consideration for the program of assistance will be approximately \$350,000,000 and that pos-

sibly \$250,000,000 will be required during the first year. This financial aid will keep British troops in Greece.

I wish to go on record as complimenting the Department of State on this show of firmness and realism in our foreign policy. It will serve the interests of the United States to halt the march of communism to the west. It will serve the interests of the United States to prevent the control of Greece by the Communists who take orders from Moscow. It will serve our interests to prevent the Soviet Union from becoming a Mediterranean power.

In 1945 I visited Vienna, Prague, Budapest, Belgrade, and Athens. From what I saw and from the information received I was convinced that Greece and Greece alone is the only hope for democracy in the Balkan area. Greece is the one country in this section where Anglo-American ideals and principles have a chance of surviving and spreading. It is the only country in which Great Britain and the United States have an opportunity to make their influence felt.

I hope that the United States will do everything in its power to aid Greece. I hope it will do everything in its power to assist Great Britain in Greece. I hope it will do everything in its power to prevent communism from controlling a strategic Mediterranean country.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

THE FISCAL POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, Senate action in reducing from six billion to four and one-half billion, the House proposal to cut spending, and then earmarking more than one-half of the proposed reduction for application to the public debt is a curious piece of business. For one thing, it would indicate a lack of confidence in the revenue committees of both House and Senate, and, secondly, it might jeopardize a reduction in taxes, no matter what form a tax bill might finally take.

Equally important is the strange hypersensitivity that has been expressed toward economy. It may be that the spending bug bit so deep these many years that there is today a confirmed allergy toward saving money for the taxpayers. It takes such interesting forms. It is whispered that the budget cannot be cut—that this is only a gesture, that military needs will not permit, that peace is in the balance, that foreign obligations will rapidly increase. These folks better call it the "bulg-et," rather than the budget.

We better get over our cynicism about this thing.

It is the arithmetic of folly to suppose that 60,000,000 American producers can carry the burdens of the whole world.

Certainly we can supply some food and medicines to alleviate hunger and suffering. But the economic heresy persists that we can rehabilitate the world.

In June of this year, we observe the second anniversary of the United Nations Charter. Who can confidently assert that real progress has been made. Red fascism marches on despite American food, cash, and credit. The largest beneficiaries of our aid are in the arms of communism. We are rapidly expending our own resources. We better begin thinking about the survival of America in this mad world.

The cynics who believed that we must continue the shell game—shelling out that is—for every purpose both at home and abroad are playing with fire. There is an end to the resources of any country where one-third of the whole national income is taken for local, State, and Federal taxes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on each of the next three legislative days I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to incorporate a radio address by Mr. Sam Pettengill, a former Member of the House.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the speech delivered by Archbishop Stepinac at his trial held at Zagreb, Yugoslavia.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMERICA FIRST

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had made that speech a year or two ago, William Powers Malone, if he had not at the moment been before the local court for disorderly conduct, might have had him down before a grand jury charged with being a seditionist, for in those days being a loyal American was in some folks' opinion a crime.

This idea that Americans should begin to think about their own country, look after their own interests, think of their country's future, has been out of the picture for some time. Since November 5 it is not quite so dangerous to talk Americanism. As an isolationist I

am glad to see that I am again privileged to speak up for my own country.

I call attention to the fact that this tax matter is just a minor affair. It is but part—a small part—of the picture. After we have given all the money and all the munitions of war and supplies in support of Great Britain, the next thing we will be asked to do is to draft American youth to go over and settle the troubles in the Balkans, Greece, in China, all over the world. That is just what is coming if we keep on the road now opening before us. That is the thing I do not like and I do not intend to do anything to promote that policy. Our dollars, our supplies, our munitions of war, our youth—millions of them—will for the third time be the pawns, the cannon fodder in the game played by the internationalists, the one worlders, by United Nations. Today I warn the mothers of America—I warn our youth of the gateway opening before them.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House this morning the serious danger that is threatening the school-lunchroom program. March 15 will find this very worth-while program bankrupt and so far as the records of the Eightieth Congress reveal there has not been any action taken to prevent this from happening. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] has introduced a bill calling for the appropriation of \$15,000,000 to continue the program through the fiscal year 1947, but no action has been taken on the bill.

I would like to call to the Members' attention a table inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 17 by Senator AIKEN which is very informative on this subject. All States participate in the program and health authorities agree that it is a fine investment which makes for better health conditions in the future. Four and one-half million children ate these balanced lunches this year.

How can we reconcile sending three hundred and fifty millions to occupied countries and deny this vital program to our youth?

The people of America want this program continued, and what the masses want we should provide, so long as it is consistent with our ability to provide it.

If this program dies during this session, its death will go down to our everlasting discredit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE LAST SPEECH OF ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the freedom-loving world watched with amazement and chagrin the trial and persecution of Archbishop Stepinac. I have had the good fortune to procure the official text of the defense speech delivered by Archbishop Stepinac at his so-called trial at Zagreb, Yugoslavia. It is not only an historical document, but it is also one of the finest statements ever made by a man who loves liberty and who would not retreat even though his own life and freedom were at stake.

I recommend that every Member of this House read the archbishop's words that I am inserting in the RECORD so that you may have a better understanding of the question and at the same time realize the patriotism and sanctity of the archbishop.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROTECTING GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have offered this day a bill to prohibit the appropriation for any unofficial purposes of certain documents by officers or former officers of the United States.

The bill specifies that no officer of the United States, while holding or upon leaving office shall appropriate for any unofficial purpose any document or portion thereof, or any copy of such document or portion thereof, which is in his possession or subject to his control by reason of his office.

The passage of this bill would prevent the fiasco of a former Cabinet officer's taking with him on his retirement from office official documents and placing them in 900 private volumes.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we declare there is no private ownership in any official documents. Anyone violating the provisions of the act would subject himself to a fine of \$1,000.

The mere offering of this bill should be warning to all officials in the Government that they cannot lift, take, and appropriate official documents and use them for their own private interests or for their own private profit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 124, Rept. No. 82), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes. That

after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower at St. Louis on February 24.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Lithuanian Legation.

Mr. CARROLL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DEBT REDUCTION

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised and shocked this morning to read a United Press dispatch quoting one of the most distinguished Members of the House, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, regarding the unanimous action of the other body in earmarking \$2,600,000 for retirement of the public debt in the legislative budget as cockeyed. If that is the attitude of the Republican Party, which he presumes to represent, then I am sure the people that I represent do not appreciate such a careless attitude toward the important subject of reduction of our record-breaking public debt.

My people prefer to have debt reduction rather than tax reduction and it certainly is not cockeyed to vote for debt reduction when we have the most staggering debt in the world's history.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman going to vote to cut down all of these appropriations that are not essential? In other words, is he going along with the idea to determine whether we are going to have any money at all to pay for the things which the gentleman and many Members of the House voted for?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will vote to reduce every nonessential item. I will do that, but I still say we have to reduce this public debt and to reduce it is not cockeyed action by the Congress.

a plot of approximately 15¹/₁₀ acres of land located in the city of Los Angeles, Calif., and acquired by the United States through condemnation proceeding No. 2044-BH, Civil, in the District Court of the United States for the Central Division of the Southern District of California, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like an explanation of this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am not in a position to explain it. I am sure a request will be made to have the bill go over.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that this bill is programed for later on in the week, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the situation, perhaps, objection should be made, but I did discuss this with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the other day, and he said that the urgency of it was that the beet sugar contracts are just now under way in certain parts of the country, and if we are to get sugar produced and have these beet sugar growers signed up, they should know what the labor program will be. There is considerable urgency about it if you are going to have the sugar produced this year that we want in this country.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to say that the Committee on Agriculture was before the Committee on Rules this morning, and because of the urgency of quick action, a rule was granted for the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1350) to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a National Archives of the United States Government, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, in view of the fact that the report accompanying this bill does not comply with the rules, I

ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR PROMOTION OF SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1713) to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to press the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] to explain the difference between the present figure of the retirement amount on the present annual basis, and the annual basis as proposed in the bill.

Mr. REES. The best information we have from the Post Office Department is to the effect that it does not change the amount so much that the substitute employee receives at the end of the year as in the long run. However, this measure would bring about a much easier method of computing his salary. The Post Office Department recommends the passage of the bill and all postal employee organizations support it. They tell us it will save a lot of time, energy, and expense in computing the salaries of these substitute employees. It is beneficial not only to the substitute employees but to the Post Office Department, and it will not cost the Government any more money.

Mr. DEANE. Does the Post Office Department sponsor this bill?

Mr. REES. It does.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, of course the inquiry submitted by the gentleman from North Carolina is in connection with his duties as a member of the objectors committee on this side. As we all know, it is very important that Members introducing bills or committees reporting out bills make statements concerning them for the RECORD when requested to do so, because that plays a very important part in connection with the interpretation and the administration of the legislation in the future.

Mr. REES. If the gentleman will yield, it is of benefit not only to the Congress but the country to know exactly what kind of legislation we are adopting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all substitute employees in the postal service shall be promoted successively at the beginning of the quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service in each grade until they reach the maximum grade authorized for the respective assignment, without regard to the number of hours they are actually employed in the postal service during the year.

SEC. 2. Each substitute employee in the postal service shall, for promotional and leave purposes, receive credit for one-twelfth of a year for each whole calendar month that the substitute employee has been on the rolls as a substitute since his last promotion

as a substitute or appointment as a substitute, whichever is later: *Provided*, That when a regular employee has been reduced to a substitute position, the months of service as a regular employee shall be included with the months served as a substitute to determine the date he will be eligible for automatic promotion under section 1 of this act: *Provided further*, That the automatic promotion of a substitute employee in the postal service shall be withheld (1) for 3 months when such employee is absent on leave without pay and not available for duty for 90 days during a calendar year; (2) for 6 months when such employee is absent on leave without pay and not available for duty for 180 days during a calendar year; (3) for 9 months when such employee is absent on leave without pay and not available for duty for 270 days during a calendar year; and (4) for 1 year when such employee is absent on leave without pay and not available for duty for 360 days during a calendar year.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of the act of March 6, 1946 (Public Law 317, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to provide credit for past service to substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to extend annual and sick-leave benefits to war-service indefinite substitute employees; to fix the rate of compensation for temporary substitute rural carriers serving in the place of regular carriers in the armed forces; and for other purposes," is amended to read as follows:

"Upon appointment to a regular position in the postal service, any employee who was a substitute in the postal service prior to July 1, 1945, shall receive credit for actual substitute service including time served as a special-delivery messenger, performed prior to July 1, 1945, computed on the basis of 1 year for each unit of 2,448 hours of service, but such credit shall not exceed 4 years. The credit thus computed shall be added to credit for the time the employee has been on the rolls as a substitute employee in the postal service on and after July 1, 1945, computed on the basis of one-twelfth of a year for each whole calendar month that the employee has been on the rolls. Upon the appointment of any such employee to a regular position he shall be placed in the salary grade to which he would have progressed had his original appointment been made to a regular position of grade 1, plus four grades, and the progression shall be computed on the basis of years of substitute service as herein provided. Any fractional part of a year's substitute service accumulated since the last compensation increase as a substitute shall be included with the regular service as a regular employee in determining eligibility for promotion to the next higher grade following appointment to a regular position: *Provided*, That no substitute shall be appointed to a higher grade of a regular position than the highest grade to which employees may progress through annual promotions: *Provided further*, That upon appointment of a substitute employee to a regular position he shall not be placed in or promoted to a grade higher than the grade to which he would have progressed, including benefits authorized by section 23 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, had his original appointment been to a regular position of grade 1: *And provided further*, That employees shall not be allowed credit for service performed under temporary or war-service appointments except when such service is continuous to the date of appointment as a classified substitute or regular employee."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATION OF STREPTOMYCIN UNDER FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2045) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of streptomycin, or any derivative thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what the occasion is for the enactment of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. The occasion for its enactment is a request on the part of the Food and Drug Administration, which is concurred in by the manufacturers of this drug.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the specific purpose of it?

Mr. HINSHAW. The specific purpose of the bill is to include the drug known as streptomycin with insulin and penicillin in the requirement as to testing their capacity to do the work, and certification.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is it a protective measure?

Mr. HINSHAW. It is a protective measure, for the purpose of protecting the users and the doctors who prescribe the medicines. The bill states that the potency of the drug must be stated upon the bottle, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has the American Medical Association said anything about it?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; but I assume the American Medical Association, having approved the other action, likewise approves this. If it does not, certainly the manufacturers want to have the testing done.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am wondering if there have been any complaints about this preparation to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HINSHAW. The complaints come from both the manufacturers and the Department, that it is necessary to certify the potency of this drug in the normal use of it. Only through batch testing such as is done for penicillin and insulin can this be assured.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I explain to the gentleman from Ohio that there is a similar law applicable to penicillin and insulin, and this bill is to bring streptomycin into the same category, for the protection of the public, because there are manufacturers who are bringing much of these drugs onto the market without making the proper test. The Government desires to make that test, according to my understanding.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that streptomycin has cured a great many cases? I know of a man in the hospital who was operated on 16 times. The bone graft never took, but he has no infection at all, and streptomycin cured him.

Mr. CARROLL. It is a wonderful drug. They do not know how effective it is, and they do not know how toxic it will be. The Government has to experiment to test its qualitative and quantitative effect.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 301 (j) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 21, ch. 9), is amended by inserting "506, 507," after "section 404, 505."

SEC. 2. Section 502 (1) of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "or streptomycin" after "penicillin."

SEC. 3. The heading of section 507 of such act, as amended, is amended by inserting "or streptomycin" after "penicillin"; and the first sentence of subsection (a) of such section 507 is amended by inserting "or streptomycin" after "penicillin."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE FEDERAL FIREARMS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1778) to amend the Federal Firearms Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New Jersey, the author of the bill, if I am correct in my understanding that this bill is merely to amend the law to correct a situation which arose in the circuit court of appeals?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman has correctly stated the purpose of the bill. The subject matter of the proposed amendment came to the attention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce by reason of a communication addressed to the Speaker of the House by Tom C. Clark, Attorney General. He pointed out in his letter dated February 3, 1947, an unfortunate situation which resulted in the setting aside of a conviction because of a deficiency which exists in section 1, subsection 6, of the Federal Firearms Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1250, U. S. C., title 18, sec. 901 (6)). This deficiency was pointed out by the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in the case of Nicholson against United States, decided March 29, 1944 (141 Fed (2d) 552). In that case defendant was convicted in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California of a violation of the Federal Firearms Act, in that he knowingly transported a firearm in interstate commerce after having been convicted of a crime of violence. He had previously been convicted of robbery in the first degree. The circuit court of appeals reversed the conviction on the ground that robbery had not been included with other crimes of violence enumerated in the definition contained in the Federal Firearms Act of 1938. In the drawing of the original bill the word "robbery" was omitted. It was undoubtedly an oversight. The amendment proposed by this bill is for no other purpose than to correct the mistake and make clear that robbery

was intended to be included in the definition of crimes of violence.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, supplementing what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has said, does this bill have anything to do with requiring generally the registration of firearms such as shotguns and rifles, as has been proposed in other legislation?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The bill has nothing to do with the subject that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SHORT. If it did, it would not get very far; I can assure the gentleman of that.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I can assure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], that I am in full accord with the views that underlie the statements they have just made. If the amendment I have proposed had gone as far as to apply to the situation to which they have in mind I would not have introduced the bill. It applies only to shipments by those individuals who have been convicted of crimes of violence, such as we know robbery to be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, subsection 6, of the Federal Firearms Act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1250; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 901 (6)), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"The term 'crime of violence' means murder, manslaughter, rape, mayhem, kidnapping, robbery, burglary, housebreaking; assault with intent to kill, commit rape, or rob; assault with a dangerous weapon, or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "section 1, subsection 6" and insert "paragraph (6) of the first section."

Line 7, insert "(6)."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARBLEHEAD MILITARY RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 450) providing for the conveyance to the town of Marblehead, in the State of Massachusetts, of Marblehead Military Reservation for public use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if there is any consideration involved in this transfer?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. There is no consideration involved in the transfer. This bill is patterned entirely on three bills which passed the Congress last year for the transfer of Fort Morgan, in the State of Alabama, the transfer of lighthouse property in the city of Atlantic City, N. J., and the transfer of lighthouse

CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 2102

MARCH 3, 1947.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. Res. 124]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 124, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.



House Calendar No. 30

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 124

[Report No. 82]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 3, 1947

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the
4 Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2102) to pro-
5 vide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the
6 farm labor supply program, and for other purposes. That
7 after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill
8 and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided
9 and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority mem-
10 ber of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read
11 for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the con-

1 clusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the
2 Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with
3 such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous
4 question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and
5 amendments thereto to final passage without intervening
6 motion except one motion to recommit.

House Calendar No. 30

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 124

[Report No. 82]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H. R. 2102,
a bill to provide for a six months' extension
and final liquidation of the farm labor sup-
ply program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois

MARCH 3, 1947

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

mas 4

DIGEST OF

CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued March 5, 1947
For actions of March 4, 1947.
80th-1st, No. 41

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	8	Labor, farm.....	1,16	Property, surplus.....	7
Budgeting.....	3	Lands.....	12	Reports.....	6
Education.....	10	Lands, farm.....	9	School-lunch program....	2
Executive authority.....	5	Lands, reclamation.....	18	Soil conservation.....	15
Flood control.....	17	Machinery, farm.....	14	Sugar.....	19
Food, production.....	13	Minerals.....	9	Taxation.....	4
Forests and forestry.....	9	Personnel.....	11	Trade, foreign.....	6

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to provide for 6-months' continuation and final liquidation of farm-labor supply program. Rep. Folger spoke in favor of supplemental appropriations for school-lunch program. House sent Legislative Budget to conference. House agreed to resolution providing for investigation of executive-agency actions beyond scope of authority.

HOUSE

1. FARM LABOR. Passed, 243-110, without amendment H. R. 2102, to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program (pp. 1710-29).
2. SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. Rep. Folger, N. C., spoke in favor of a supplemental appropriation for this program (pp. 1703-4).
3. LEGISLATIVE BUDGET. Reps. Taber, Knutson, Wigglesworth, Reed of N. Y., Dirksen, Jenkins of Ohio, Cannon, Doughton, Mahon, and Cooper were appointed conferees on H. Con. Res. 20, the Legislative Budget (p. 1700). Senate conferees were appointed Mar. 3.
4. TAXATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 1030, to continue war-time excise taxes (pp. 1699-700).
5. EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY. Agreed, 304-42, without amendment to H. Res. 118, authorizing the Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee to investigate any action, rule, etc., of a Federal agency where complaint is made that it is beyond authority, invades constitutional rights, or inflicts penalties without proper defense (pp. 1705-10).
6. REPORT was received from the Export-Import Bank on operations through Dec. 31, 1946 (p. 1734).
7. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Rep. Bender, Ohio, criticized the handling of surplus property (pp. 1730-3).
8. ADJOURNED until Thurs., Mar. 6 (p. 1734).

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Wed., Mar. 5.

- 2 -
BILLS INTRODUCED

9. FARM LANDS. H.R. 2358, by Rep. Passman, La., to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 1734.)
10. EDUCATION. H.R. 2362, by Rep. Douglas, Calif., to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery school education. To Education and Labor Committee. (p. 1734.)
11. PERSONNEL. H.R. 2371, by Rep. Keating, N.Y., to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act. To Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (p. 1735.) Remarks of author (pp. A877-8).
12. LANDS. H.R. 2354, by Rep. Ellsworth, Oreg., to reopen the revested Oreg. and Calif. Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1734.)
H.R. 2363, by Rep. Ellsworth, Oreg., relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain lands in Oreg. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 1734.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. FOOD PRODUCTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Murray, Wis., analyzing some facts as to the world's food supply and using statistics on U.S. food imports from and exports to Holland as an example of food-shipment trends (pp. A871-2).
14. FARM MACHINERY. Rep. Smith, Wis., inserted a letter from an agent of a farm equipment company in Poland setting forth the conditions of farm-equipment supply and demand in that country (pp. A889-90).
15. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Trimble, Ark., inserted a Marion County (Ark.) PMA Conservation Committee letter reporting on soil-conservation practices there during the war and favoring the continuation of conservation payments (p. A881).
16. FARM LABOR. Extension of remarks of Rep. Johnson, Calif., favoring continuation of the farm-labor supply program for the remainder of the 1947 crop year (p. A892).
17. FLOOD CONTROL. Rep. Angell, Oreg., inserted Gen. Wheeler's (Chief of Engineers, War Department) statement before the Rivers and Harbors subcommittee outlining the policy and method of procedure of the Corps of Engineers in the construction of rivers and harbors, flood-control, and multiple-purpose projects (pp. A869-71).
18. RECLAMATION. Rep. Robertson, N.Dak., inserted a N. Dak. Legislature resolution urging the construction of previously authorized dams on the Missouri River development (p. A875).
19. SUGAR. Rep. Hall, N.Y., inserted his recent radio address in which he urged that sugar be made available for canning in 1947 (p. A883).

operations is being carried on in the United States by the Russian Government. One phase of this legal espionage has been the tapping of the inventive genius of America's industrial and military development for the benefit of the Soviet Government.

Since 1943, the Soviet Union, acting through its agencies in the United States, has succeeded in obtaining practically every industrial, chemical, and military patent from our patent office—hundreds of thousands of them—dealing with every phase of our technological development. They have ordered as many as 60,000 in one request. And what have we received in return? Nothing. Since 1927, Russia has refused to give us a single patent, yet we have obligingly handed to them in this one-way exchange, our industrial and military know-how.

Russia obtained these patents, for example, by having one of their front agencies in the United States flood the patent office with orders for patents. One order from this dummy agency dated January 2, 1945, called for all patents for the year 1942 and part of 1943. This agency known as the Four Continent Book Corp., of 253 Fifth Avenue, New York City, is described on its letterhead as being importers from the U. S. S. R. of new, old, and rare books.

They did it by having the Amtorg Trading Corp., of 210 Madison Avenue, New York City, official trading agency of the U. S. S. R. in the United States, place orders for thousands of patents in every field.

They did it by having the Soviet Purchasing Commission, of 210 Madison Avenue, New York City, file huge orders and by having their embassy and consulate offices in the United States likewise place orders. They even had the Soviet Legation, in Ottawa, Canada, placing orders.

I sent committee agents down to the patent office to get these orders and I have them here. They are most interesting, and we shall continue to investigate various phases of this matter.

This is a sample of the way Russia uses her allies. They are mere birds to be picked clean and get nothing in return. And what kind of patents did the Amtorg Trading Corp. request? As an example, I shall refer to their order of April 20, 1944, and list and describe the patents:

Patent No. 2,316,885: Airplane.

Patent No. 2,316,895: Parachute and parachute pack.

Patent No. 2,316,896: Parachute and parachute pack.

Patent No. 2,316,949: Method of plasticizing synthetic rubber.

Patent No. 2,317,019: De-icing device for airplane propellers, wings, and so forth.

Patent No. 2,317,115: Parachute.

Patent No. 2,317,392: Portable emplacement for machine guns.

Patent No. 2,317,412: Military tank.

Patent No. 2,317,610: Airplane-wheel construction.

Patent No. 2,317,945: Bullet-resistant glazing unit.

Patent No. 2,317,973: Cartridge belt.

Patent No. 2,318,155: Gun-rifling machine.

Patent No. 2,318,333: Aircraft propeller.

Patent No. 2,317,238: Gunfire-control apparatus.

Patent No. 2,317,251: Ship control.

Patent No. 2,317,256: Bomb-dropping device.

Patent No. 2,317,267: Aircraft wing system.

Patent No. 2,317,285: Float for aircraft.

Patent No. 2,317,323: Resilient tire.

Patent No. 2,317,340: Helicopter.

Patent No. 2,317,341: Helicopter and method of operating same.

Patent No. 2,317,354: Explosive cartridge assembly.

Patent No. 2,317,358: Communication system.

Patent No. 2,318,301: Bullet-resisting armor.

Patent No. 2,318,833: Airplane control.

Patent No. 2,320,238: Aircraft gun and gunner's seat mount.

Patent No. 2,281,336: Recovery of rubber.

Patent No. 2,320,354: Gyroscope system.

Patent No. 2,320,574: Hydroaircraft.

Patent No. 2,320,971: Method of making explosives.

Patent No. 2,320,986: Mine sweeper.

Patent No. 2,321,044: Trigger mechanism for firearms.

Patent No. 2,321,045: Repeating firearms.

Patent No. 2,321,051: Stabilized horizon—aircraft instrument.

Patent No. 2,321,312: Ship torpedo protector.

Patent No. 2,321,298: Ammunition manufacture.

Patent No. 2,321,321: Cartridge shell crimper.

Patent No. 2,321,323: Ammunition trimming apparatus.

Patent No. 2,321,344: Projectile.

Patent No. 2,321,543: Gyro drift control.

Other orders requested such patents as bomb sights, pilot directors, range-finding and flight-director apparatus, and thousands of other technical and military patents which will help in building Russia's military might.

But there is another and more extraordinary and interesting aspect of this sudden and frantic effort of Russia to secure within the past few years all of our industrial techniques and processes. We now know that the real secret of the atom bomb is a thousand secrets, comprising the industrial processes and extension of processes which only American industry and genius have mastered. Therefore, Russia must unravel and put together this jigsaw of processes to get the know-how.

To my mind, it is no coincidence that Russia's sudden interest in all of our patents on industrial development was simultaneous with our atomic research and development.

Through our coddling policy of giving Russia our patented knowledge, she may well be on her way to the discovery of many, if indeed not all, of these thousands of industrial processes and secrets

which constitute the great secret of the atomic bomb.

Mr. Speaker, if our Government is to survive, such folly and legal espionage must cease. Consider how ridiculous we are to permit Russia to have in this country at this very moment, 3,696 official agents, while in Russia we have approximately 210 people. That includes our Embassy employees, UNRRA, Red Cross, the Army and Navy, and their wives and dependents. The ratio, in other words, is 18 plus to 1. This to my way of thinking is not realistic reciprocity.

Not only did Russia burden our Patent Office with these orders, they even had the audacity on July 26, 1945, to have the Amtorg Trading Corp. call upon our patent office to furnish them with all German patents for 1941, 1942, 1943, and part of 1944. Who was responsible for permitting this one-way patent traffic with the Soviet Government? I think Mr. Henry Wallace, former Secretary of Commerce, should answer to the proper committee of this House as to why such a policy was permitted.

On March 10 of this year, General Marshall will represent the United States at the Four Power Conference of Foreign Ministers to be held in Moscow. I would like for him to take a copy of my remarks with him and to cite it as an example of the type of cooperation we are receiving from Moscow.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 304, nays 42, not voting 86, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—304

Abernethy	Bennett, Mich.	Carson
Albert	Bennett, Mo.	Chadwick
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Chelf
Allen, Ill.	Blackney	Chiperfield
Allen, La.	Boggs, Del.	Church
Almond	Bolton	Clason
Andersen	Bonner	Clevenger
H. Carl	Boykin	Coffin
Anderson, Calif.	Bradley, Calif.	Cole, Kans.
Andresen	Bramblett	Cole, Mo.
August H.	Brehm	Colmer
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Cooper
Andrews, N. Y.	Brophy	Corbett
Angell	Brown, Ga.	Cotton
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Coudert
Arnold	Bryson	Courtney
Auchincloss	Buchanan	Cox
Bakewell	Buck	Cravens
Banta	Buffett	Crawford
Barrett	Bulwinkle	Crow
Bates, Ky.	Burke	Cunningham
Bates, Mass.	Burleson	Dague
Battle	Busbey	D'Alesandro
Beall	Butler	Davis, Ga.
Beckworth	Byrnes, Wis.	Dawson, Utah
Bender	Cannon	Delaney

Devitt	Jones, Ala.	Priest
D'Ewart	Jones, N. C.	Ramey
Dingell	Jones, Ohio	Rankin
Dirksen	Jones, Wash.	Rayburn
Dolliver	Jonkman	Reed, Ill.
Dohmengeaux	Judd	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Rees
Dorn	Kean	Reeves
Doughton	Kearns	Rich
Eaton	Keating	Riehlman
Elliott	Keefe	Riley
Ellis	Kelley	Rizley
Ellsworth	Kennedy	Robertson
Elsaesser	Kerr	Robsion
Engel, Mich.	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Evins	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Fallon	Kilday	Rohrbough
Fellows	Knutson	Ross
Fenton	Kunkel	Russell
Flsher	Lanham	Sadlak
Flannagan	Larcade	St. George
Foot	Latham	Sanborn
Fulton	Lea	Sarbacher
Gamble	LeCompte	Sasscer
Gary	LeFevre	Schwabe, Mo.
Gavin	Lewis	Schwabe, Okla.
Gearhart	Love	Schryner
Gifford	Lucas	Seely-Brown
Goff	McConnell	Shafer
Goodwin	McCowan	Sheppard
Graham	McDonough	Slkes
Grant, Ala.	McDowell	Simpson, Ill.
Grant, Ind.	McGarvey	Smathers
Gregory	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Gross	McMahon	Smith, Maine
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Ohio
Hagen	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Hale	MacKinnon	Smith, Wis.
Hall	Macy	Snyder
Edwin Arthur	Mahon	Speace
Hall	Maloney	Springer
Leonard W.	Manasco	Stanley
Halleck	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Hand	Mason	Stigler
Hardy	Mathews	Stockman
Harless, Ariz.	Meade, Ky.	Stratton
Harness, Ind.	Meade, Md.	Sundstrom
Harris	Merrow	Taber
Harrison	Meyer	Talle
Hartley	Michener	Teague
Hedrick	Miller, Calif.	Thomas, N. J.
Hendricks	Miller, Conn.	Thomason
Hertter	Miller, Md.	Tibbott
Heselton	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Hess	Mills	Towe
Hill	Monroney	Trimble
Hinshaw	Morris	Twyman
Hoeven	Muhlenberg	Vail
Hoffman	Murray, Tenn.	Van Zandt
Holifield	Murray, Wis.	Vlson
Holmes	Nixon	Vursell
Hope	Nodar	Walter
Horan	Norblad	Welchel
Howell	Norman	Welch
Hull	O'Brien	West
Jackson, Calif.	O'Konski	Wheeler
Jarman	Owens	Whitten
Javits	Pace	Whittington
Jenison	Passman	Wigglesworth
Jenkins, Ohio	Peden	Williams
Jennings	Peterson	Willson, Tex.
Jensen	Phillips, Calif.	Winstead
Johnson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.	Woodcott
Johnson, Ill.	Pickett	Wood
Johnson, Ind.	Potts	Youngblood
Johnson, Okla.	Preston	Zimmerman
Johnson, Tex.	Price, Fla.	

NAYS—42

Blatnik	Forand	Mansfield,
Boggs, La.	Gordon	Mont.
Camp	Gorski	Marcantonio
Carroll	Granger	Morgan
Celler	Havener	Murdock
Clark	Heffernan	O'Toole
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Deane	Kee	Rabin
Douglas	Kefauver	Rains
Drewry	King	Sabath
Durham	Kirwan	Sadowski
Eberharter	Klein	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Lusk	Worley
Fogarty	Lynch	
Folger	Madden	

NOT VOTING—86

Barden	Case, S. Dak.	Davis, Tenn.
Bell	Chapman	Dawson, Ill.
Bland	Chenoweth	Donohue
Bloom	Clements	Elston
Bradley, Mich.	Clippinger	Engle, Calif.
Buckley	Cole, N. Y.	Feighan
Byrne, N. Y.	Combs	Fletcher
Canfield	Crosser	Fuller
Case, N. J.	Curtis	Gallagher

Gathings	Lodge	Rayfiel
Gerlach	Lyle	Redden
Gillette	McCormack	Richards
Gille	Mansfield, Tex.	Rivers
Gore	Mitchell	Rockwell
Gossett	Morrison	Rooney
Griffiths	Morton	Scoblick
Gwynne, Iowa	Mundt	Scott, Hardie
Hart	Norrell	Scott,
Hays	Norton	Hugh D., Jr.
Hébert	O'Hara	Short
Hobbs	Patman	Simpson, Pa.
Huber	Patterson	Somers
Jenkins, Pa.	Pfeifer	Stevenson
Kearney	Philbin	Taylor
Keogh	Ploeser	Vorrs
Landis	Plumley	Wadsworth
Lane	Poage	Wilson, Ind.
Lemke	Poulson	Wolverton
Lesinski	Powell	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. McCormack for, with Mr. Powell against.
 Mr. Engle of California for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.
 Mr. Morton for, with Mr. Rooney against.
 Mr. Fletcher for, with Mr. Dawson of Illinois against.
 Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Keogh against.
 Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Somers against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Canfield with Mr. Feighan.
 Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Byrne of New York.
 Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Redden.
 Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Rivers.
 Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Bland.
 Mr. Bradley of Michigan with Mr. Kefauver.
 Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Huber.
 Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Barden.
 Mr. Short with Mr. Clements.
 Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Gathings.
 Mr. Scoblick with Mrs. Norton.
 Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Lane.
 Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Philbin.
 Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Gore.
 Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hart.
 Mr. Gillette with Mr. Morrison.
 Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Hébert.
 Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Chapman.
 Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Kearney with Mr. Hobbs.
 Mr. Curtis with Mr. Patman.
 Mr. Fuller with Mr. Poage.
 Mr. Paulson with Mr. Combs.
 Mr. Gwynne of Iowa with Mr. Crosser.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF DR. ALMA RICHARDS AND MRS. MARY BLOCK

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 348, No. 5 on the Private Calendar, be restored to the calendar for further study.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, upon unanimous consent request I was granted permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday. As the House does not meet on Wednesday, I ask unanimous consent that the time be transferred to Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 124 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] such time as he may require, and ask unanimous consent that he may proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dangerous boundary lines in the world today is in Korea.

It was created artificially with the sanction and approval of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It was done in secret and without either the knowledge or consent of the American people. It splits the Korean nation asunder.

Korea is back in the headlines today. These headlines are fraught with the gravest peril.

On one side of the line, and in control of 10,000,000 unhappy Koreans, is a huge military force of Soviet Russia. On the other side of the line, and in control of 20,000,000 unhappy Koreans, is a relatively small military force of the United States Army.

Soviet and American troops were reported the other day to have exchanged shots across this infamous and abominable boundary, the thirty-eighth parallel.

Our American commander, Lt. Gen. John R. Hodge, back in Washington to report on Korea, says the Russians are creating in their zone a slave army of nearly half a million Koreans. The reason for this is that the Korean people and their leaders in the South want their own representative government. But Russia tolerates no freedom near its doorstep. Accordingly, it has marked Korea as its next victim.

We are told that history repeats itself. Right now a repetition of the vilest sort is working itself out with results that may be disastrous for the United States.

We all know how Poland was sold down the river in a power-politics deal that benefited no country except Soviet Russia. Exactly the same thing is now happening on the other side of the world—in Korea.

Russia wanted control of Poland and she got it in a secret deal. Russia also wanted control of Korea, and she is in possession of the northern half of that country as the result of still another secret deal.

We all know that Korea is a friendly country. The Koreans fought valiantly against our common enemy—Japan—for 40 years. We all know that Koreans were promised their independence at the Cairo meeting attended by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek. We know that this promise of independence was reaffirmed at Potsdam, with Russia sitting in.

We look at a map and we see Korea split in two, just as Poland. We see that the Red army of occupation is sitting in northern Korea, down to the thirty-eighth parallel. We know an American force is occupying southern Korea, waiting until the Russians agree to withdraw so the Americans can leave, too, and give the Koreans their independence. But there are no signs that the Russians have any intention of getting out. Instead, they are digging in.

The Russians poured into Korea during the last week of the war just as fast as they were able to get there. Although there was no fighting, the Russians went in with a force of a quarter of a million men. They pushed right up to the thirty-eighth parallel line and began to fortify it as though it were the permanent boundary of a hostile power. The only power on the other side of the line was a small force of Americans. The Americans have not fortified their position. They did not crowd up to the Russian line, but left a neutral no-man's land 2 or 3 miles deep between themselves and the Red army.

The Russians at once dropped an iron curtain down along the thirty-eighth parallel line. They refused to let newspapermen into their zone. They would not even let official representatives of the American Army go in. They stopped all trade and all travel back and forth across the line. They shut it up so tight that they will not even broadcast weather information from the northern zone to American weather stations in the south.

Inside their zone in Korea the Russians have applied the same tactics they have used in Poland and elsewhere. They

have clamped on a totalitarian dictatorship. They have prohibited freedom of speech, so the Koreans could not criticize what they are doing. They keep out all news from the outside world, so they can tell the Koreans just exactly what they want them to hear. They plaster all the towns with pictures of Lenin and Stalin, and they fill the newspapers and airways with Communist propaganda. And they forbid any Korean to listen to any radio program from outside.

The Russians are hurrying just as fast as they can to make northern Korea a Communist state. They have brought back into their zone several hundred thousand Koreans who had fled to Siberia to escape the Japs, and who have been indoctrinated with communism. They have set up a puppet Communist administration which they claim allows "self-government" to the Koreans in their zone, and they are using three methods to make Communists of as many as they can of the 10,000,000 Koreans who are captive north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

These three methods are force, bribery, and exile. Let us examine them one at a time.

The first method has all the Communist totalitarian earmarks of sheer terrorism. For the first 2 months of their occupation the Russians turned their army loose on the people to rape, loot, and brutalize just as they pleased. When a semblance of "order" was restored, it was the order of the prison house. Koreans were not allowed to travel outside their own villages without papers of identification—and they can only get those papers after they have convinced their Russian masters that they will be "good" collaborators with the Communist regime.

The Russians also announced that all Koreans who had collaborated with the Japs should be punished. They decided at the start that all Koreans who owned property were Japanese collaborators, so they seized their property and put the Koreans in jail. They took Cho Man Sik, the Korean patriot leader of the north, and tried to make him head of the Communist regime. When Cho Man Sik refused to cooperate with them, they threw him in jail. He has never been heard from since.

The Russians in northern Korea have made it perfectly plain to the people there that the only way to be safe is to give up their national patriotism and support the Russian plans.

Their second method of imposing a Communist state is by bribery. They took over all Japanese-owned property, and all the landholdings of the rich Koreans as well. They then proceeded to redistribute the farm lands. They had some 2,000,000 acres of arable land in their possession, and here is what they did with it. They divided it up into communes. They then told the Korean peasants that in order to hold any land in a commune, they would have to work with the Communist Party. The choice was to play the Russian game, or to starve.

Actually, this land redistribution was a gigantic fake. The Russians told the

Korean farmers that the old share-crop system of paying half their crop to the landlords as rent was a crime. That extortion, they said, was ended by the beneficent rule of the Communists. But, they explained, of course the new government had to be supported by taxes. And for the time being at least, the taxes would be the same 50 percent of the crops.

The Korean peasants, naturally, were helpless to oppose the Red army's will. Whatever the terms offered, they had to accept. So they moved back onto the same old farms, and operated them in the same old way. But now title rests in the Communist Party, and they are subject to the will of the Communist state.

The third method the Russians have used is exile. There have been many Koreans who would not accept the new regime on the Russian terms, but at the same time were generally so well-behaved that there was no excuse for executing them or throwing them in jail. To these Koreans the Russians gave the opportunity to escape. They could leave all their property behind, and sneak down through the mountains to the American zone. Thousands of patriotic Koreans accepted that choice. They left their property, their friends, and their home communities behind to join their 20,000,000 fellows south of the thirty-eighth parallel.

This is only a part of the story in Korea today. It is a system based on agreements made in secret, and it operates in secret behind the iron curtain the Russians have dropped across the thirty-eighth parallel line. But it is far from being the whole story.

In northern Korea the Russians are trying to establish communism so firmly that they will always have a Communist regime there to help them dominate the future of the country. But they also are spreading communism through the American-occupied south by every means in their power.

In order to get money with which to do this they substituted a military currency for the 5,000,000,000 paper yen in circulation in their zone. The Americans have kept the paper yen in the south, so all the five billions the Russians have acquired have been available for their propaganda activities in the south.

The question is, What does the United States intend to do to block Russian plans to make Korea another Communist puppet state? We agreed with them at Moscow in December 1945, that Korea should be reunited and a Korean provisional government set up over the whole country. But this decision has never been put into effect. When the Russian-American Joint Commission met last spring to try to put it into effect, the Russians blocked any action by insisting that only Communists should be consulted or permitted to have any part in the provisional government.

That is the situation concerning Korea today. Eighteen months have passed since the Japanese surrender. The Cairo pledge of independence for Korea is further away today than ever before. The Russians are entrenching themselves

solidly in northern Korea. The job of prying them loose from Korean control is growing more difficult with every day that passes.

Yet, so far, our only policy is to let the situation alone and wait. What I want to know is what are we waiting for? Why are we giving the Russians still more time? They said over a year ago that they were ready to get out. Why are we not demanding that they keep their word?

The Moscow decision of 1945 has never been enforced. Unless we are willing to sell Korea down the river just as Poland was sold, we had better take some positive action now. The time has come for us to tell Russia that the promises she has made must be kept. If the United States is ever to have any position of respect and prestige in the Orient, the pledges we have made to the Korean people must be made good. We can never win friends by continuing to back down. Nor can we win friends by denying the Korean people self-government, maintaining a censorship, preventing them from trading with the rest of the world, and treating them not as allies—which they were—but as enemies, which they were not.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

This bill, allowing the continued recruitment and channeling to critical farm areas of domestic and foreign farm labor, was reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and it cannot, in any way, be construed as a partisan measure. Therefore the Committee on Rules, mindful of the pressure of other business, and cognizant of the bipartisan nature of the bill, has provided but 1 hour's general debate. This resolution allows amendments under the 5-minute rule, and provides one motion to recommit. As this is a general rule, I doubt that there will be any objections to it.

It is not my intention to infringe upon the prerogative of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture by going into the details of the provisions of H. R. 2102, but I would like to make some general observations regarding the need for extension of the farm-labor program, as provided in this bill.

Like so much other legislation that has come, and will continue to come before this body, H. R. 2102 is designed to eliminate some of the uncertainty that has arisen out of the economic and social dislocation resulting from the war. For a number of reasons, most of which are directly traceable to the war, farm labor is critically short. This shortage of manpower works a hardship not only on the farmer, but on the canners and other food processors, and ultimately the burden falls on all consumers, who will face a shortage of food unless immediate action is taken.

Because of uncertainty about the supply of farm labor, farmers throughout the country will hesitate to plant crops larger than they can harvest with the

help they now have available. That will mean that many thousands of acres of land will lie idle during the growing season. Whereas, these same farmers would plant crops on all tillable acreage if they were assured the labor necessary at harvest time. This bill would tend to remove that uncertainty.

Canners and food processors contract with producers for crops before the actual planting. As I have pointed out, farmers hesitate to contract sale of more than conditions at planting time indicate they can produce. This causes great uncertainty among canners, packers, and other types of processors. Confronted with this dilemma, it is impossible for them to make adequate plans for processing and distributing food.

The general public is not aware, and therefore, at present, unconcerned with the shortage of farm labor. But it is obvious that it is the consuming public that will bear the brunt of any shortage of food arising out of a farm-labor shortage. It is the duty of Congress to foresee such contingencies, and to prevent them. And that is what this bill is designed to do.

I understand that farm associations, canners, and consumer groups have all endorsed this bill, and, as I stated previously, it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture. I urge your sympathetic consideration and favorable vote on the bill, and the adoption of House Resolution 124, to make possible its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

EXTENSION OF FARM LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the war, at the urgent request of agriculture, and on a showing that an additional supply of farm labor was needed to insure the continued increase in the production of crops already rising by leaps and bounds, the President and the Democratic Congress passed the farm labor-supply program act.

The act was highly advantageous to farmers, and provided them not only with a supply of docile labor bound by contract but also provided a substantial subsidy through the assumption of all but direct wages by the Government.

But I certainly do not begrudge our farmers that added subsidy; they established a magnificent wartime production record. It was wartime. Emergency measures were well justified. I supported the legislation then, and I merely want the record to show that this was another benefit to agriculture initiated and carried out by the Democratic administration.

SET UP EXEMPTIONS FROM IMMIGRATION LAW

It seems pertinent at this time also to point out that in addition to outright appropriations of funds the law also exempted native-born residents of North and Central America and the adjacent islands from payment of head tax on entry to the United States and from nearly all other provisions of law relating to immigration of residents of this hemisphere except departure bonds.

To protect farmers from labor raiding, a rigid prohibition was written into

the law against paying transportation of any individual from one county to another unless the county agent in the county of resident certified his non-essentiality, while all protection of the workers under the minimum wage laws or possible housing standards.

NEW DEAL LEGISLATION NOW EXTENDED

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I supported this act at the time of passage, and far from begrudging any wartime benefits to the farmers who made America the granary of democracy while our workers made it the arsenal of democracy, I give them all praise.

But now the war is over.

The emergency is passed by, our Republican colleagues have assured us time after time as they have attacked every control which might have helped us pass through the dangerous and delicate reconversion period without the present price chaos.

Why, then, are they reintroducing this wartime act, which a few years ago they denounced as New Deal legislation, and asking for its extension until next December 31?

I am gratified and amazed that they actually find some of the legislation enacted by the Democratic Party under the leadership of President Roosevelt admirable and desirable and beneficial to the farmers and to our Nation. I am sorry only that the farmers of our country seem to have failed to appreciate the fact that not only this enactment but countless other New Deal laws were to their direct advantage and have refused to recognize the accomplishments of the Democratic party and the Democratic administration.

They will soon, if I am a judge of political weather.

BENEFITS OF LABOR SUPPLY ACT

Let me quickly run over some of the direct benefits of the farm labor-supply act, Mr. Speaker.

Approximately 275,000 individuals have been imported in the 4 years of the operation of the act: in 1943, 65,000; 1944, 84,581; 1945, 73,435; 1946, 51,149.

By country of origin, agricultural workers included 201,621 from Mexico; 47,890 from Jamaica; 12,351 from the Bahamas; 4,095 from Barbados; 9,980 from Canada; and 1,735 from Newfoundland. In addition, we had 135,283 Mexican track workers and 15,129 industrial workers from British Honduras, Barbados, and Jamaica.

The cost of transporting these foreign laborers, including travel and subsistence from their native country to their place of employment here and return was borne by the Government to a total cost of approximately \$30,000,000.

The Government established 161 farm labor supply camps and centers in 25 States. The pay of the foreign agricultural workers varied from State to State, but it was low-priced compared with industrial wages in war plants and to a large extent this labor replaced the American farm laborers who were drawn to high industrial wages. The hourly pay ranged from 65 cents to \$1.05 in California; from 50 to 65 cents in Colorado and Indiana; 30 to 45 cents in Louisiana.

FARMERS IN ADVANTAGEOUS POSITION

Reports today indicate that the American farmer is in the most advantageous position of any segment of the national economy; and I dare say has profited as much as any industry in the United States. Various reporting services show that net profits of farmers are 135 percent above normal expectations.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may insert in my remarks information as to the prices which the farmers now receive and the cost consumers pay for food and other agricultural products, in comparison with former levels.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Under leave given me I will also insert in the RECORD the higher prices of food that now prevail.

Ever since you gentlemen on the left first emasculated and then murdered OPA, cost of living has increased more than 50 percent. I have called attention to that fact before and I shall call attention to it again so as to bring home to the American people who is responsible for the ever-rising prices. Reports indicate we have not yet reached the top; that the prices will still soar. Only in this morning's paper I read where one of the outstanding Republicans appeared before a committee and demanded that we should get rid of the OPA and eliminate sugar rationing and the ceiling on sugar prices now holding down the price of sugar to a reasonable figure. He feels and he so testified, that the price of sugar should be increased 50 percent and said sugar may reach a price of 20 cents. I think it is outrageous to make such a request which would affect every person in the United States, not only the masses but many industries.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair to the farmers of this country who were called upon to reach unexcelled production during the war. The gentleman stated he intended to put in the RECORD the present high prices which are being paid by the consumer for the farmers' products. Will the gentleman also be fair to the farmers and insert in the RECORD the prices which the farmer has to pay for the machinery and for the things which he has to buy, that are made in the industrial centers such as the city which the gentleman represents?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker; I ask unanimous consent that I may have the right to include those prices or any other prices that go into the cost of living as requested by the gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SABATH. I first insert the cover page of the April 29, 1946, report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, in order that it may be seen how the ensuing figures are computed. Note that at this time, almost a year ago,

prices received by farmers had reached 117 percent of parity:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS,
April 29, 1946.

INDEXES OF PRICES PAID BY FARMERS FOR COM-
MODITIES, AND OF PRICES PAID, INTEREST, AND
TAXES, 1910-1945

Prices received by farmers for agricultural commodities averaged about 117 percent of parity on April 15, 1946. Parity prices for agricultural commodities having as their base the period August 1909-July 1914 are calculated by the use of the index of prices paid, interest, and taxes, while parity prices for commodities whose base period is August 1919-July 1929 or August 1934-July 1939 are computed by use of the index of prices paid. Current estimates of these indexes are published each month in *Agricultural Prices*. In view of the widespread interest in parity prices and the parity indexes currently in use, a short description of the construction of these indexes, together with appropriate tabulations is reissued in the following pages.

What is the index of prices paid by farmers for commodities? It is an attempt to measure as accurately as possible the over-all changes that occur in the level of prices charged to farmers and their families for commodities used in living and farm production. The indexes are based upon prices for 86 items used in family living and 94 items used in farm production. Prices are obtained quarterly from several thousand retail merchants serving the farm population in all parts of the Nation. In addition, reports are obtained each month from feed dealers and chain-store operators and these are used as a basis for estimating changes between the regular sample surveys taken in March, June, September, and December. Prices were collected only annually from 1910 through 1922.

Briefly, the steps in calculating the indexes are as follows:

1. Prices paid for individual commodities are averaged by States and then weighted by the latest available estimate of purchases of each item made by farmers in each State to obtain an average for the nation.

2. National average prices are combined into various sub-indexes—food, clothing, feed, etc.—by giving each item a weight based upon the average quantity purchased per farm during the six years 1924-29. The subgroup values or aggregates thus obtained are then expressed as a percentage of the values or aggregates for the same commodities during the base period 1910-14.

3. The sub-indexes are then combined into an index of prices paid for commodities used for family living and an index of prices paid for commodities used in farm production. These two indexes are then combined into a single over-all index of prices paid by farmers by weighing each according to its relative importance with regard to farm expenditures during the six years 1924-29. The percentage weights used in combining the various group indexes are shown on page 26.

4. The index of prices paid by farmers for commodities is combined with interest per acre on mortgage indebtedness secured by farm real estate and taxes per acre on farm real estate to obtain the index of prices paid, interest, and taxes by giving prices paid for commodities a weight of 86.0 percent, interest 7.2 percent, and taxes 6.8 percent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to avoid the insertion of long rows of figures, I am going to take the liberty of excerpting the most pertinent facts.

First I shall summarize or excerpt from a table showing the index numbers of prices paid by farmers from 1923 to

1947 for commodities used in living. This table shows—and I am taking the February 15 reports as being closest to the time of this debate—that in 1923 the index figure was 160.

Under the Republican misrule of the ensuing 12 years that figure fell steadily, and toward the last rapidly, to 114 in 1932 and 101 in 1933, when it began to climb again. Do not be deluded by the idea that this was advantageous for the farmers; for if it cost them less to live they also received still less for their own labor.

From 1933 this figure climbed steadily—120 in 1934, 123 in 1936, 121 in 1940—when prices for farm products were high—148 in 1942, 177 in 1944, and now, with all price controls off on the things which farmers have to buy merely to live, an all-time high of 248 on February 15, 1947.

The cost of things that farmers have to buy to be able to produce—the tools and implements and feed and fertilizer—followed living costs, but have not risen so high because the last Republican drive failed to kill all the controls on those items.

Beginning with 142 in 1923, this index rose to 149 in 1929, the year of the boom that burst, and sank rapidly to 102 in 1933 when the Democratic administration came in. The rise has been steady but not nearly as great as in food and other living items, until on February 15, 1947, the index reached 215.

Now, when all those items are combined, but without adding taxes and interests, we see that the index started at 152 in 1923, sank to 101 in 1933, then came up as the Democratic administration began to bail out the country after the Republican crash, and reached the all-time high of 234 last February 15.

But now, in spite of all the talk about high taxes, we see a strange thing when taxes and interest are added.

The weighted average index number was 167 in 1923 under the Republicans, 15 points higher than with only living and production items; but on February 15, 1947, the weighted index number including living and production costs, taxes and interest was 221, 13 points lower than without taxes and interest.

It seems the farmers have received some benefits in that field under the Democrats, also.

INDEX SHOWS HIGHEST PROPORTIONATE RETURNS

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have supplied the gentleman with figures on what the farmer pays.

Let me turn now to a table which compares what the farmer has to pay out with what he takes in.

Again, I am going to summarize and excerpt to save space and time; but I heartily recommend an earnest consideration of this table to every American farmer who wants a high standard of living and an adequate return, so that he will see how he has fared in the last 37 years in black and white.

This table goes back to 1910, and the average of prices in the 4-year period, 1910-1914, equals 100.

Under President Wilson farmers' costs grew but incomes grew faster, and the ratio between expenses and income

topped parity for the first time in 1917 when the index reached 118. In 1920, when the Republicans were elected, it was still at 104 of parity.

This parity ratio dipped to 75 in the first year of Republican misrule; climbed slowly to 80 in 1930; and then, in the grand debacle of Hooverism, slid down to 64 in 1931, 55 in 1932, and then up to 60 in 1933.

In 1942 this index—and remember this is the ratio between prices paid and prices received—again topped parity at 106; in 1943, 119; in 1944, 115; in 1945, 116; and in 1946 reached the all-time high of 120.

In 1946 prices received by farmers had hit the historical record of 233, compared with an index figure of 194 for all farming costs—living, production, taxes, and interest. Because these figures are a little different from the others I gave you, let me remind you that the scale here is the 1910–14 base average of 100.

AVERAGE PRICES ABOVE PARITY

Now, Mr. Speaker, I turn to another table in the report of agricultural prices issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on January 29, 1947, which gives a comparison of prices for an earlier base period, then with calculated parity prices, and then with average current prices. I am going to select just a few items; but it must be borne in mind that these are not retail prices, but the prices received by farmers in the rough, so to speak.

Wheat: In the 1909–14 base, \$0.884; parity January 15, 1947, \$1.90; average price same date, \$1.91.

Rye: 1909–14 base, \$0.72; parity January 15, 1947, \$1.50; average price on that date, \$2.18.

Potatoes: 1918–19 base, \$1.12; parity January 15, 1947, \$1.45; average price that date, \$1.29.

Apples: 1909–14 base, \$0.96; parity January 15, 1947, \$2.06; average price that date, \$2.65. Citrus fruits were selling below parity on that date but have since risen sharply.

Hogs: 1909–14 base, \$7.27; parity January 15, 1947, \$15.60; average price that date \$21.80—and have since risen to \$29 and even \$30. January 15, 1946, \$14.10.

Beef: 1909–14 base, \$5.42; parity January 15, 1947, \$11.70; average price then, \$17.30. January 15, 1946, \$11.80.

Lambs: 1909–14 base, \$5.83; parity January 15, 1947, \$12.60; average price \$19. January 15, 1946, \$13.

Butterfat: 1909–14, \$0.263; parity, \$0.565; average price, \$0.717, and \$0.492 a year ago.

Milk: 1909–14, \$1.60; parity, \$3.64; average price, \$4.68—\$3.20 January 15, 1946.

Eggs: 1909–14, \$0.215 parity, \$0.462; average price, \$0.397.

RETAIL PRICES RISE MORE QUICKLY

I have one last quotation from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, this time from the report of February 28, 1947. This report, I must explain, shows that with removal of controls on lumber a rapidly rising lumber cost has pressed the index of what the farmer buys higher, more than could be compensated for by a fall in the price of feeds.

Now, on page 6 of this report, I find that the prices received by farmers on February 15, 1947, for all farm products, with no allowance for seasonal adjustment, was 262 percent of the 1909–14 base average; just a month before the index was 260. On livestock and products it was 278; on meat alone 319; on dairy products 270.

On prices paid by farmers for all commodities and for interest and taxes the index was 221 percent of the base; on living costs, 248 percent—and that is the figure, of course, for American citizens generally; and for production costs, 215.

The last figures for farm machinery were 187 on December 15, 1946.

SUBSTANTIATED BY PRIVATE INDEXES

The Dun & Bradstreet index of weighted average commodity prices, representing 31 food staples, hit \$6.62 on February 25, an all-time, purse-shattering record.

On the same day the Dun & Bradstreet general commodity index stood at 252.33, a rise of 40 percent in a single year.

Read the grocery-store advertisements in the daily newspapers, or go out shopping yourself.

Try to find any choice meats at less than 70 cents a pound. Buy pork chops or lamb chops if you dare.

Here is a big Washington dairy which charges 18 cents a quart for milk, 60 cents a dozen for eggs. A 12-ounce package of cottage cheese costs 25 cents. Coffee which sold a few months ago at 29 cents is now 51 cents. New potatoes are advertised at 3 pounds for 23 cents, and that is a bargain price. Flounder is 43 cents a pound.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman before that request is granted, to state to the House if he is for or against this bill.

Mr. SABATH. This is the resolution.

Mr. KEEFE. Are you for or against this bill? I know you are talking on the resolution from the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; once more I am going to support this farm-subsidy bill. I do so in the hope and the belief that you gentlemen who represent agricultural districts and farmers' interests will reciprocate when legislation affecting the interest of labor is before us. Unfortunately, you have not in the past shown that friendliness toward labor that labor has for you. Nevertheless, and as I have said, I am supporting this legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Wisconsin knows, I have advocated this and all other measures to aid agriculture. I am still in favor of helping the farmers of the country; but on the other hand I feel that these continuous demands for increase of prices, whether for cattle or hogs or anything else, must stop, because the American people cannot afford them.

Personally, as I stated, I voted for this act as a war measure. At that time labor

was scarce and the Democratic administration went to great lengths to aid the farmers in obtaining labor from Mexico and other countries. The farmers were able to produce, they had sufficient labor and in many instances cheaper labor than they could obtain right at home. In addition to this imported labor they also had something like a hundred thousand prisoners of war assigned to the farms, to whom they were not obliged to pay the high wages which they frequently complain of.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman made a very interesting remark when he said that it cost the United States Government a certain amount of money to bring these laborers in for the benefit of the farmers and the big agricultural employers throughout the country. Does the gentleman know how much it cost the taxpayers for each one of these workers?

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not. I have the figure somewhere, but not right before me. As you know I am speaking extemporaneously. The over-all cost was about \$30,000,000 for 4 years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Perhaps I can help the gentleman out.

Mr. SABATH. I will appreciate the help.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As I recall, it cost something like \$200 each to bring these agricultural workers in. That was the transportation and administrative cost. I know the gentleman's record of voting for subsidies for the farmers and others. Does not the gentleman agree that this is a subsidy for the farmer?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; it was a subsidy to the farmer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. What I am pleading for now is that in view of the fact that prices have gone higher than ever dreamed of, let them stop urging still higher and higher prices, in the interest of the millions of people obliged to work for wages and those whose income is very meager. We have nearly 18,000,000 white collar workers and those who live on annuities, a little interest here and a little other income there. These 18,000,000 people cannot live under present conditions. I am afraid that unless this thing is stopped somewhere, an end put to this ever-increasing upward spiral of prices, labor must of necessity demand their wages be increased.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. In a minute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I have already yielded to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield to everybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I only want the gentleman to yield to one.

Mr. SABATH. I always try to accommodate my friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman does and I hope he will again. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a brief question, but make it brief, please.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] called attention to how much it costs to get each individual worker to this country so that the farmers could grow food to feed the people in Illinois and other places. Can the gentleman tell me how hungry they would get if the farmer did not grow this food?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I will say that the people working in the big cities, in Chicago and in Michigan and in other sections of the country, if they could not get food raised by farmers, would get very hungry. But before the people in Chicago or anywhere else in the country can obtain food, the farmer must have implements, the farmer must have tools, the farmer must have many things before he can grow the crops and before he can send them to the market. He requires labor, and the labor which produces these facilities for the farmer, making it possible for the farmer to produce, is entitled to live and is entitled to sufficient earnings to provide for themselves and their families. As I said before, with all the friendship I have for the unappreciative farmers of this country, notwithstanding the fact I hope they will continue to prosper, I trust they will go no further in pressing for higher prices.

NOT ALL NEW DEAL LAWS BAD?

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this action on the part of the Republican majority in approving New Deal legislation justifies me in saying that not all New Deal legislation, and which they strenuously opposed, was as bad as they tried to lead the country to believe.

Legislation adopted under the leadership of President Roosevelt and the Democratic Party was in the interest of the country and of the masses. The country produced more, we experienced greater prosperity, there have been greater profits and greater accumulations than ever before in the history of the world. The people that should be taken into consideration now are those people who are obliged to work for meager wages or salary, who cannot afford the ever-increasing cost of living. Those are the ones I am interested in and I hope in the future the Republican majority will be obliged to approve many other acts that have been passed during the Democratic administration in the interest of all the people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. For a question, not for a speech.

Mr. GROSS. For an observation?

Mr. SABATH. No. I do not need any information.

Mr. GROSS. Then for a question.

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. GROSS. Why were the writers of this legislation, those New Deal writers, so short-sighted that they had this expire in the middle of a crop year? We are only asking to have it carried through to

the end of a crop year in order to cover up the confusion that the gentleman's party created by having it expire in the middle of a crop year. This is not an extension of New Deal legislation.

Mr. SABATH. That is the very best we could do, that is the best we could get out of it, because you opposed nearly all of the legislation and we were obliged to reduce and to limit the time so that we could get legislation for the farmers through this House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact, and I think almost everyone in the House knows it except the gentleman who just propounded the question, that the Congress provided the labor program should terminate 6 months after the termination of hostilities?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is right, I fully appreciate that, but, as I say, hostilities are over, yet the Republicans still come in and ask for an extension of the legislation.

Therefore, I am not going to oppose the rule making this bill in order, because once more I am going to aid the farmers to the best of my ability, in the hope that they will recognize and appreciate their friends, and what has been done for them, and that they will come to the conclusion that they should show some appreciation for the great services that have been rendered them by the Democratic Party in the years gone by.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has a right to express concern over the question of the price and the supply of sugar in this country. I would like to say to the gentleman that for my part, and the part of many members of the committee, this bill was reported out largely in order to assure as sufficient a supply of American sugar production as possible. That is one of the principal purposes.

Mr. SABATH. I fully appreciate that the importation of Mexican labor is in the interest of the sugar beet growers in Colorado, Michigan, and other sugar beet growing sections. I know also that it will be beneficial to other farmers and to the canners. In fact, as I have said, the only thing that I am pleading for is that we should stop rising prices, if we can, by legislation; that we should hold prices down and stop the inflation that is with us now and may plague us in the years to come.

I only fear that if avaricious profiteers have their way, not only will sugar jump to 20 cents—or perhaps to 50 cents—but all other commodities in proportion.

(Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I confess that it is with some trepidation that I lift my rather feeble voice in opposition

to a bill which, according to report, has the unanimous endorsement of the legislative Committee on Agriculture. I do so for a good many reasons, but perhaps at the outset some history ought to be recited so that there is a full appreciation of what is before us.

The impact of war upon the country was certainly burdensome upon our manpower and upon industry and upon agriculture, and those functions and enterprises that had to depend upon manpower. Everybody is familiar with the fact that the long arm of the draft reached into the human quotient of the country and siphoned away boys from the farm as well as from the city. Everybody knows the difficulties that we encountered and the necessity for setting up a Manpower Commission to conserve energy wherever possible and keep people in the industries that were producing the sinews and the materials of war. So, during the war, there was a genuine physical labor shortage. It is a thing to be emphasized. There was a genuine physical shortage of manpower. So we had to subsidize or supplement our manpower wherever we could in order to keep crops moving. The result was that in an appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1944 there was written this whole labor supply program. I had a part in it. It was done in a deficiency bill, as I remember, and I was a member of the subcommittee that was in the conferences that finally provided that legislation in an appropriation bill. We made provision then for the apportionment of a certain amount of money to the Farm Extension Service in the different counties for the purpose of carrying on a program of farm recruitment and farm placement.

Then we gave to the administrator of the program the authority to bring people in from outside the United States. It was in pursuance of that authority that people were brought in from Newfoundland, that people were brought in from Mexico, that people were brought in from the Bahamas, and that people were brought in from Jamaica, for a variety of functions in the whole agricultural domain. There were some of these people de-tasseling corn in the corn belt where I live. Others were engaged in picking vegetable and fruit crops. So there was a need for it. We appropriated altogether \$113,100,000 for this program.

But today the war is over. The war is nearly two years behind us, and we do not have this physical problem any more. The young men who went forth to fight for their country are back home, in large part. The young men and the old men who were laboring in industry operating lathes and bandsaws and drills and all this other machinery to produce shells and airplanes, and equipment, are no longer engaged in those pursuits. That physical requirement has relented with the war. So we have a labor quotient in the country today that ought to be sufficient for our purposes.

The fact of the matter is that we have about 2,400,000 and probably more, people unemployed, as of the last figure that I could obtain from the Department of

Labor this morning. One million nine hundred and fifty thousand of those are men. That figure is as of January 15, 1947. There are 1,050,000 veterans who are unemployed as of January 15, 1947. The latest figure on agricultural labor was the month of October, and the number was about 220,000, as I remember it. The fact of the matter is that there has been an increase in the number of unemployed in the country since October of substantially 450,000, and that may be a rising curve.

It occurs to me as a fundamental proposition, as a matter of national philosophy, that with the war over and our manpower back home, is there a real philosophical, is there a real logical justification for going beyond the confines of this country to find people in other countries to be imported at an average expense of perhaps \$250 or more to plant the crops and to harvest the crops of our own country?

We boast about our ingenuity in the field of agriculture, and we vaunt to all the world how productive we are, yet we propose now to carry on a philosophy that began in wartime and for which, in my judgment, there is no logical excuse now.

If an allergy toward certain kinds of work is developing in America, do we propose now to appease it by going beyond our borders to find people from the outside to do our work, or are we going to follow a philosophy that accounts for the ruination of the Old World today and makes them suppliants at our door to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars?

The best observer I know came back recently. He was officially accredited by this country. At breakfast I said, "What did you find over there?" He said, "The most startling thing is that the willingness to work and the will to work has gone out, except for one country."

We have already several millions of unemployed. Then, when we cannot coax men into the harvest field or into a vegetable patch, we say, "We will go abroad and find them, and spend the money of the taxpayers of this country."

I live in a farm belt. I am reasonably close to the American Farm Bureau Federation and to the National Grange. They are my friends and I trust that they regard me as a friend. They come before the committee on which I have been serving which has been providing money for the Department of Agriculture for years. But, ladies and gentlemen, there is something involved here, whether you agree or not, that seems a departure from a very fundamental concept. If we cannot get people of our own to work, then we ought to meet the issue resolutely and go back and spell out some of the difficulties and weaknesses in other laws like the whole social-security fabric where a person does not have to take a job unless suitable employment has been found, and if suitable employment is not furnished to a person, that person can receive the largesse of this country which is paid for by the taxpayers and he does not have to work even though today there is this opportunity to find people on the outside.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have a great regard for my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who brings leadership and talent to the Committee on Agriculture, so I find myself always in a distressing position when I have to part company with him. Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. May I say to my friend from Illinois that I respect his opinion deeply though he is on the opposite side of this question for the same reasons that he has expressed.

The gentleman told us how many unemployed people we have in the country today. Can the gentleman tell us whether he can guarantee that any one of those people who are unemployed will get down on their knees and thin beets or pick peas and detassel corn or do some of these necessary things? That is the problem confronting the farmers of the country. It is a very real problem. I am in full sympathy with what the gentleman from Illinois has said on the philosophical side of it, but we have a real problem here which the committee is trying to meet by bringing this legislation to the floor of the House. It clearly extends the act for 6 months and then liquidates the program.

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I take the liberty of repeating the observation made by the gentleman from Kansas. He says: "What guaranty is there that out of the unemployment reservoir of this country you can get those people to thin out beets and do that kind of work for which the imported labor will be required?" That is a fair question. Let me give you the parallel. Chester Bowles and John Small were sitting here last year and they were telling us about the difficulties of getting the brick plants of the country started so that there might be an adequate supply of bricks for veterans' housing. I said, "Mr. Small, as Administrator of the Civilian Production Administration, why is it?" He said, "Well, the fact of the matter is they cannot get any people." I said, "Why cannot people be found to do the rough and dirty work in a brick plant?" He said, "They cannot pay enough." Consequently with an OPA ceiling on the price of bricks, there were 187 brick plants shut down, as I remember the figures. I said, "What is the answer?" He said, "We want to see Mr. Bowles to get him to lift the ceiling. When they can get \$2 a thousand more for brick and can pay a little more for help, then they can get the people to work." Is that perhaps the answer? I do not know. But it does seem to me so singular to go beyond our borders to find people to come in and do our work.

There is something more important involved here. In the first place, you are going to have a duplication of effort. If you look at the bill you will find in section 2 that this farm-placement work shall go on and in addition thereto the United States Employment Service shall have the restrictions upon it removed so it can also pursue the job of farm-placement work. Let us look at that for a moment. First, on the 15th of November, after a running fight that lasted nearly 8 months on the floor of this House

in which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] took such an active part, we finally got the United States Employment Service back in the hands of the States.

It was a great job, but the farm-labor-supply program was in effect at the time and the United States Employment Service, then a Federal function, said administratively—you will find the allusion to it in the committee's own report, at the bottom of page 2—they said, "Administratively we have concluded this program." The reason they concluded their placement activities was simply because Congress provided a farm-labor-placement program in an appropriation bill. Now it is proposed to lift that restriction and have the emergency program go to the end of the year and at the same time to have the United States Employment Service carry on that recruitment and that placement function. If this bill were not passed, by administrative order, and not by legislation, the United States Employment Service could then resume the placement function, and seek to find people to do the work that is necessary in the agricultural field.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I just want to say the provision to which the gentleman alludes was put in the bill for the express purpose of meeting the situation which he so well described in the earlier part of his remarks. It was put in there for the purpose of meeting the situation, by giving the State employment offices the right to assign a man to a job on the farm; to place him on the farm, if he came in and asked for a job. Heretofore, as the gentleman knows, that has not been possible. I will agree there may be an element of duplication for a period of 6 months, but the committee felt, in view of the fact that we were operating in the middle of the season and that the State employment services were not equipped to take this over, there would be no harm in having the two agencies with authority to make placement during that brief period. Of course, that was the purpose of the committee in putting into the legislation what might superficially look to be a duplication for a short period of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman agree to this, that if this bill were not passed, the United States Employment Service administration office in Washington could issue an administrative order and get it translated to that whole program now on a State basis so that they could go on with the program of recruitment and placement of farm workers, and we will meet this whole proposition with the exception of the importation of farm workers from foreign countries, because that authority would cease as of June 30, 1947? Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I agree that they could do that. In other words, the reason would be taken away which they now give for not placing farm workers.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed my feeling on this and it seems to me we have got to make this transi-

tion from war to peace and make it now. One way to do it is to resist the legislation that is now proposed. We must make a constructive start in terminating war programs. We must make our contributions to the cause of economy by preventing expenditures all along the line which are not justified. I do not feel that the expenditure which this bill will authorize is justified and so I feel constrained to oppose it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has again expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield briefly. My time is short.

Mr. BUSBEY. If this bill is passed, in your judgment do you not believe this would be a double subsidy; a subsidy on the farmers and also a subsidy in the way of unemployment compensation for these 2,000,000 people who are not working?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Whether or not it is a subsidy is not the question today. It is whether or not you want food.

I follow two distinguished gentlemen, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], who represents the great agricultural area of downtown Chicago, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is my own chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. Yet, neither of those gentlemen, with all the knowledge which they have of this subject, has had time to give you all the facts on this bill.

The gentleman from Illinois is correct, that the matter of paying the costs of bringing in labor did start during the war, but the farmers of California, nor the farmers of Texas, nor the farmers of New Mexico, nor Florida were not the ones who started it. It was the result of a new understanding between the State Department of the United States and the Republic of Mexico, which is an independent Republic over which we have no control.

Failure to pass this will not re-create the earlier situation to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] so eloquently refers. It could be re-created. I have an idea that the farmers of the United States would be very much in favor of seeing it re-created, but as far as 10 years before the date given by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] this same situation existed. Forty years before that the same situation existed, at certain times in harvests in certain areas of the United States for labor for the harvesting of flash crops, the crops that come into harvest suddenly. Some of our fruits and vegetables must be harvested within a few days if they are to be taken to the markets of Chicago, New York, and other areas.

The legislation refers to both domestic and imported labor. The Extension Service, or some other agency, is to have charge of the movement of domestic labor from place to place as it is needed. There come times, however, and these

have existed every year throughout the history of agriculture in the United States—there comes a time when it is necessary to secure a supply of labor which cannot be had from any domestic source. Up to the date suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] it was possible to arrange for the bringing in of this supplementary labor, for the payment of it, the harvesting of the crops, and the return of the laborers to Mexico or wherever the laborers might have originated.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] contends that we have some 3,000,000 unemployed in this country, and consequently he assumes we can get these men to go out on the farms and do this stoop labor. Well, that would be fine, but try and get them to do it. It is just one line of work that not one in a thousand will think of accepting. Now, then, there are some large manufacturing plants in Illinois—perhaps even in the district of the gentleman who spoke against this bill. If those manufacturers of farm equipment had been able to produce the machines, it would not be sufficient to plant and harvest these sugar beets.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman is correct. I thank him.

Mr. BARRETT. But for the past year and a half, since the fighting has been over, these farm-machine-equipment people have been practically at a standstill, and so we have not been able to get any help from that source. We cannot get the labor here at home and we cannot get the machines, so we need this bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the 4 minutes' time remaining on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we are faced with a very amusing situation here today. We find the Republican leadership bringing in a bill that calls for subsidies out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States for a certain class. I want to pay a little compliment—indeed a big compliment—to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He speaks so persuasively in the well of this House. I always listen to his remarks although I confess I do not always follow his advice—but I do listen to his remarks because I realize they come from a sincere heart and they come with a good deal of statistical evidence behind them. He is, at least, consistent in the position he is taking here, the position of economizing by cutting down on these extra governmental expenses. The Republicans passed a bill the other day to cut \$6,000,000,000 off the budget. If you are going to support this farmer-subsidy

bill how are you going to make a \$6,000,000,000 budget cut? I know some of my friends from my own State will take exception to these remarks but I will say that during the wartime I supported the subsidy program, supported it for the consumers to keep down the cost of living so there would not be strikes, so there would not be demands for more wages and so that the price of war materials would not go up.

I also supported the subsidy program to bring farm labor into California, and the other farm States, but as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] stated, the war is over. We have a growing unemployment roll in the State of California and throughout the Nation. Why are you going to go ahead and bring in a bill here that will require more subsidies?

It does not seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Republicans' stand on this point is very consistent. It costs about \$200 apiece to bring in these laborers from Mexico to New Mexico, California, Utah, and other States. That \$200 comes out of the taxpayers' pockets. Who gets the benefit of that? The big agricultural employers, whether they be in the State of California, Louisiana, Florida, or wherever they are located. They get these employees at a reduced rate. They would probably have to pay a little more if they went into the open labor market, but they get cheap labor by this bill. It is all right with me for them to get cheap labor, but if they are so anxious to get this cheap labor, why do they not pay the \$200 themselves? Why do they come to the tax treasury of the United States to get this \$200?

Just recently there was a change made in the definition of "agricultural employment." They can bring these men in not only to work in the fields but also to work in packing sheds, to truck vegetables, and to go into all the other fields of endeavor that have some close association with agriculture. You will find here a very easy means of bringing in cheap labor to cut down on the American standard of living and the American wage scale.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman familiar with the contracts under which foreign labor is brought into this country under this program?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman find any provision in those contracts for importing cheap labor? Is not the wage paid to these people who are brought in the wage rate that is agreed upon between two sovereign governments, and is it not compatible with the wage rate that is paid in that area of the United States?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Part of what the gentleman says is very true.

Mr. KEEFE. It is not cheap labor, is it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, yes; it is, and I will tell you why. If the gentleman's contractual agreements were not made on the basis of a certain minimum of 75 cents an hour, then the agricultural employer would have to go into the field of American labor and pay whatever was

necessary to get the labor. That is why it is a contractual agreement in behalf of cheap labor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

(Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to tell from this debate today whether this is a politically controversial matter; but I am sure that there is one event, upon which we can all agree at this point in the debate, that is not controversial. If I mistake not, it was 34 years ago today that the former distinguished Speaker of this House the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, commenced his membership in this body, and from this side of the aisle I am sure we can also say it is not a controversial political matter as to whether he has rendered a fine service to the people of Texas and to the people of this country during that 34 years.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is well at this time to pause to pay our respects to the former distinguished Speaker. The House of Representatives has been his life and love. Permanent history will record his work as one of the great speakers of this Republic. We congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and if you continue to reside in Texas we hope for you 34 more years of service. We cannot elect Republicans down there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat surprised that the opposition has stated this is a continuation of the farm-labor program. I voted in committee to support the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] on the premise that we would wind up the affairs of this whole farm-labor program as soon as possible.

As an operator of a small family-sized farm myself, I found one way to overcome the farm-labor shortage. Fortunately, unlike many others, I have four boys and two girls, and I have been able to divide the duties of our farm among the six children, so that they take the burden off me to quite some extent. I am not a large operator by acreage but I can say that so far as the farm-labor shortage goes on my farm premises I have not suffered from it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. As a mother and a grandmother, may I inquire whether the gentleman is obeying the child-labor laws?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I want to assure the gentlewoman that question would hardly enter into my picture, because, first, the children like to do their 1 hour's work a day, and second, they are doing it for themselves for

eventually they will divide what few earthly goods I have anyway.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman from New York thought that he was voting with the chairman of the committee to bring a termination of this about, I refer him to the title of the bill which says, "To provide for a 6 months' extension."

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I direct the gentleman's attention to the further title of the bill which mentions the fact that it winds up the farm-labor program. He should have continued reading the title. There is no dispute about the fact that this program has worked out, and I think we can wind it up at this time by passing this bill.

If the passage of this bill does nothing more than to harvest this coming season's sugar beet crop, as is one of its objectives, it will be justified.

Frankly, I am alarmed at the mail I receive from home about the lack of sugar everywhere in America. To a favored few, who are able to get all the sugar they need from hidden and forbidden sources, this shortage seems like a big joke. I have been challenged by that selfish group, because I want to see us all get enough sugar.

These favored few are now raising the cry that we do not need to harvest the beet sugar crop. The answer to them is, you will have a little revolution on your hands if you keep the housewives from getting more sugar. You may not realize how mad people are about this since you have enough yourselves. But give the rest of us a break. Let us get behind this program and see it through to a successful conclusion.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, during the years that I have served on the Committee on Agriculture, when this legislation has been under consideration, we have never made it a political or partisan issue, and it is not that today, in spite of the fact that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] would indicate that this was originally a New Deal measure, sponsored by the late President Roosevelt, to which the Republicans are now giving support. It was never a New Deal measure. It was a measure that was brought about by force of necessity to secure vital food production in this country.

Now, I dislike very much to continue a program of this kind. If it were not for the fact that certain laboring men in our large cities, like Chicago, do not desire to go out and do this hand work on the farms, and produce sugar beet and vegetable crops, why, there would not be any need for it. If the gentleman from Illinois would convince his people that they should go out and do this hand work on the American farms to produce sugar beets and vegetable crops and the other crops requiring a great deal of hand work, why, then you could do away with it here today.

We are now trying to get more sugar for the American people. To get it we must produce more in the United States. That takes hand labor, and unless we get this hand labor in the last 6 months of the year there will be less sugar for the American housewives and for the American consumers generally throughout the country. Now, to break off the program in the middle of the year, when the southern half of the country has had its required labor, and then leave the sugar beet crops and the vegetable crops in Northern States to the mercy of prospects of getting American labor, why, that is just nonsensical and the people will suffer from it.

I would like to point out another thing in the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois, who always claims to be such a defender of the American farmers. This measure is not in the interest of the farmers of the country. This is in the interest of the consumers of the United States so that they will have more sugar and cheaper sugar, and more vegetables and cheaper vegetables. Unless we are willing to subscribe to continuing the program for the balance of the year and then liquidate it and then take our chances in the future, why you can see there will be a scarcity of sugar and a scarcity of vegetable crops.

There may be one way out of it, and I think it could well be explored by the Congress. We have an overpopulation in Puerto Rico. What is the matter with bringing in about 25,000 Puerto Ricans to do some of this work? They claim status as American citizens. Or what is the matter with permitting some of these refugees that have been brought into the United States by the millions, you might say, to go out and work in the fields? No; they do not want to do that kind of work. So we are up against a practical situation here, a situation which deals with the reality of furnishing the people of the United States with vital food products. Therefore, I definitely feel that this legislation should be continued in the interest of the general welfare and to enable all the people of the country to secure more food.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. Everything that has been said here today, of course, the committee has considered. I think the opinion of the committee generally was the opinion expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. But the situation, after we have heard all the evidence, discloses the fact that this program is going to run to mid-year anyhow. Most of the expense has already been incurred. To extend it another 6 months certainly is not going to cost the United States Treasury a lot more money.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman, and in conclusion I urge the passage of the bill which will provide labor for the sugar beet and fruit and vegetable areas, with final liquidation of the law on December 31 of this year.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1202) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2102, with Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill extends for 6 months and provides for the final liquidation at the time of the farm-labor program, which was first set up in this country back in 1943 as a war measure. Since that time it had been renewed from year to year. This year, if no action is taken, the program will expire on July 1 next—right in the middle of the crop season.

The program consists of two parts: First, there is the foreign-labor program, which deals with the importation of labor into this country from Mexico and the West Indies. That has been running about 80,000 or 85,000 persons a year, and the estimates for this year are about the same. In addition, there is the domestic labor-placement program, whereby the extension services in the various States have undertaken the work of placing workers on the farms.

The war is over, as has been said here several times this afternoon, but the emergency, as far as the production of food is concerned, is not over.

I call your attention to the fact that the acreage goals which the Secretary of Agriculture has requested the farmers to reach this year are greater than the actual acreage at any time during the war years. So we have the farmers of this country being asked this year to produce more than they actually did produce at any time during the war. That is going to take labor. It is true, as has been stated on the floor this afternoon, that we have some people unemployed in this country, and if anyone can give me any assurance that those people who are unemployed will go out in the beet fields and vegetable fields of this country and do the hard, tough, stoop labor which is so important, then I would be the first to say that we do not need this extension. But the committee was given no assurance of that kind. In fact, all the evidence which the committee had on the question indicated there was no possibility of getting this work performed except through the importation of foreign labor.

We had before us farmers and representatives of farm organizations from all

parts of the country. The tenor of all their testimony was that they would much prefer to use native labor; that this foreign labor was not satisfactory, but it was the best they could get. They wanted it because they could not get anything any better.

It is important to pass this legislation now because this is the time of the year when the producers of sugar beets are signing up their contracts with the sugar factories and when the producers of canning crops must sign up their contracts with the canning factories. Unless those farmers can be given the assurance that they are going to have the labor to plant and harvest those crops, they cannot and they dare not sign the contracts to produce them. That is the reason the legislation is before us at this time. It is an emergency matter because if we cannot give this assurance during this month, then we are going to be faced with a continual shortage of sugar in this country and a shortage of vegetables which go into cans.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman tell us why this foreign labor would not also be necessary in 1948?

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman it may be necessary to have foreign labor in 1948. One reason we are bringing this legislation in at this time is to serve notice on the people who have been using this foreign labor that they will have to make some other arrangements in 1948. I do not know whether or not it will be necessary in 1948. In some lines of production, particularly in the production of sugar beets, mechanization is going to do a lot of this work. It is going to overcome the need for much of this hand labor. But, as was stated by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], a while ago, mechanization is just beginning. The farmers cannot get the machinery as yet which they need to plant and harvest sugar beets and thus avoid a great deal of this hand labor.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Further answering the question of the gentleman from New York, I think we must remember that these farmers are now making their plans for this crop year and entering into these contracts. When the time comes to make plans for the crop year in 1948, the farmers will know that this law is expiring. In other words, this farm-labor program is being terminated and the farmer will be making his plans with the knowledge that he will not have this foreign labor. But if we do not continue this program this year, we are going to break faith with the farmers, and I know no one in this Congress wants to break faith with the farmers of this country who have gone on the assumption that they would have this labor for this year.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Am I correct in stating that every responsible farm organization in the country, or nearly every one of them, is for this bill?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I can say to the gentleman that the farm organizations who appeared before the committee—and nearly all of them did—urgently requested the passage of this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. I yield myself two additional minutes, Mr. Chairman.

I may say further to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] there are other ways by which this foreign labor can be brought in. Under existing law, this is the only way; but if we decide later in this year that it may be necessary to bring in foreign labor in another year, then I think we can pass legislation which will make it possible for the farmers themselves or cooperative organizations of farmers to bring in this labor. But it is not possible at this time to work out the details of that kind of a program because we must know within a few weeks what the farmers can depend upon in the way of labor this year.

The question was asked a while ago as to how much this will cost. The estimates by the Department of Agriculture are that it will cost an additional \$10,000,000 to extend the program for 6 months. I am not sure that means that \$10,000,000 more than would otherwise be spent will actually have to be spent, because many of these foreigners are now in the country. Under the agreement they have to be taken back at the end of this program. It is not going to cost any more to take those now here back in December than in June, and we will have the benefit of their labor during that period.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The farmers of our country today are hesitating in mapping out their 1947 plantings for fear these workers will be returned as of June 30 this year. We should settle this question and settle it positively without further delay with respect to the 1947 crop year.

One other thought. I do not know of any surer way to prevent production of canned vegetables or to prevent the gathering of fruit crops this summer, or to further aggravate the shortage of sugar in this country, than to fail to pass this bill.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances I would be bitterly opposed to this legislation. In the beginning I want to eliminate some of the driftwood that has been brought in. This is not a continuation of so-called New Deal legislation. It is not a continuation of Republican legislation. It is not a continuation of the so-called subsidy program.

This legislation originally was considered in a nonpartisan manner and unanimously reported out of the Committee on Agriculture, because the necessity brought about by the war forced us to report the legislation.

No one is more bitterly opposed to farm subsidies than I am. I have never been in favor of the farm-subsidy program, because I have always believed and still believe the farmer is entitled to a fair price in the market place for what he produces.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, this legislation was the outgrowth of the necessity to increase our food production during the war. We found that it was necessary for the Government to go out and bring in the Mexican and this other foreign labor in order to keep our food supply up to the requirements. We went into it with our eyes open. What is the situation? Here are the farmers who were urged to produce. That urge was so great that the Federal Government went out and brought in farm labor in order to enable them to produce. This legislation as originally passed and as continued from time to time was extended from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year. Now we want to wind the program up. I want to wind it up at the earliest moment possible; but is it right to wind this program up in the middle of the crop season, especially when the demand is still upon us? Is not the decent thing, the fair thing to do to give the farmers time within which to make the readjustment? We are serving notice on them today that this program will be discontinued at the end of this year, and that is the only reason I am here supporting this legislation. I do not want to get the farmer out on a limb, encourage him to get out on that limb, and then come in here with a hacksaw and saw the limb off; I want to give him an opportunity to climb back down the tree and get his feet on the ground. That is all we are asking you to do in this legislation. This legislation, as I say, is not a piece of so-called New Deal legislation, a piece of Democratic legislation, or a piece of Republican legislation. It was reported out originally, as I remember, by a unanimous vote of the House Committee on Agriculture, and it has been extended every year by a unanimous vote. During the hearings we carefully went into the situation of winding it up but thought that it would be unfair to wind it up in the middle of the crop season. After full and complete hearings we unanimously agreed to wind the program up at the end of this year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I may say that last year in Connecticut the potato crop could not have been harvested had it not been for the Jamaicans who were in that area to harvest the shade-grown tobacco crop. They have been a well-behaved group. I have had them reside within a mile of my home

and would never know they were in the community. They have been a very desirable class of workmen.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Connecticut that that situation prevails not only in the Northeast but in every section of America.

These farm laborers were brought in in order to enable the farmers to meet the crop goals that had been set by the Secretary of Agriculture as being necessary in order to sustain our war effort.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say also that these same farmers have made their commitments, plowed their land, bought their seed and fertilizer for this year, assuming that this labor would be available.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of loose talk and there have been a great many erroneous statements made before the committee.

I am going to support this bill for the simple reason that otherwise the program would fold up in the middle of the crop year and create a lot of confusion.

Mr. Chairman, in order to get the slant from my own people I sent out a questionnaire recently asking certain questions. You know, this request comes from men down in the Department who want this thing to go on indefinitely in order to continue their jobs and make them permanent. They came in and asked for this program and that it be made permanent.

I made that point my first question and every answer that came back said, "No; this should not be made permanent."

The second question was: "Do you believe the program should be extended until the end of the crop year?" About 75 percent of the questionnaires returned said it should because of the confusion that had been created by folding it up in the middle of the crop year.

I also asked whether they found these workers satisfactory and the majority said they were better than no help at all, but not satisfactory.

I asked them this question: "Do you believe farm labor for 1947 could and should be recruited from the ranks of the unemployed within the United States?" The general feeling was that help should be recruited from the ranks of the unemployed but a good many questioned whether it could be done as long as men get \$20 a week for not working.

Those fellows down in the department were very strong in telling us that the farmers want this labor. It was definitely stated by them that the State of Pennsylvania wants 600 of them. So I added another question and I asked: "Have you been consulted by any Federal agency concerning your labor require-

ments for 1947?" Two said they were consulted and told them they would not need any. Every one of the other answerers replied: "We were not consulted."

This goes to show that the men down in the Department of Agriculture have strenuously misrepresented the case. It is not true that the farmers want this help because they are cheap. I have seen man and wife migrants from Florida digging potatoes in my district getting \$30 a day. I have seen Puerto Ricans and Jamaicans getting \$16 a day picking cherries.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers do not want this labor. They all want this program to be folded up at the end of the crop year and it can very well be.

So far as the harvesting of canning crops is concerned, this is no longer strictly a farmer's problem. The canners do practically everything in many cases except the planting and cultivating. They do the picking, they do the spraying, they gather the beans, and they gather the tomatoes. Some of the canning companies recruit their own help in various parts of the country. They bring them from Baltimore and other cities in large groups. They are sick and tired of these foreigners who come in here, 70 percent of whom it can be proven by the records have venereal disease.

I have a letter from one of my canners who states:

One of the labor camps was on my property for the last 3 years. During 1946 I could not see my way clear to hire any of them. I left the canning factory idle and a number of the farms practically idle for the reason that I could not produce enough of crops to pay help when they were taking two men to do one man's work. Why can't we have the names of the unemployed and strong hardy people who are on relief published in our papers so that we may know who to get in contact with when we want help?

It is universally the opinion that this foreign labor is not the kind of labor we should employ. Local labor could be recruited. For instance, one of the largest canners in the eastern part of the country located in my district rather than take any of these people went to the anthracite coal region and brought down boys and girls who, he stated, are worth twice as much as these fellows from Jamaica, Puerto Rico, and Mexico.

I have a canning company up there that states:

Commenting only for my company, the foreign agriculture-labor program was one of the least satisfactory and most expensive Government projects affecting us during the war years.

Another canner has this to say:

We had considerable experience with foreign labor as well as prisoner-of-war labor, and, therefore, can report the following as first-hand experience:

Generally speaking, the program by the Department of Agriculture was entirely negative and the only labor we secured from that Department was some Jamaicans. Up to about the beginning of 1946 the program by the USES was satisfactory and considering the labor they had available, the USES did a good job. At the beginning of 1946 we realized that we would no longer have prisoner-of-war labor, and we had been employing during each summer an average of better

than 150 prisoners of war a day. We therefore had to make plans for 1946 to replace this prisoner-of-war labor. We gave careful consideration to imported labor from the Bahamas and from Jamaica. To use this labor, housing had to be erected. The labor itself had never proved very satisfactory except for the first year, which was about 1943. After that time this labor not only proved quarrelsome and expensive but very inefficient. In view of this we decided that we would spend all of our efforts toward securing local labor; and supplement local labor with the normal migratory Polish labor out of Baltimore. To this end we erected additional housing and had a very satisfactory supply of labor during 1946.

In 1947 the prospects are about as follows:

1. Sufficient male labor will be available for all jobs in this area.
2. The quality and efficiency of labor are beginning to improve.
3. Female labor is still short and will probably continue short during 1947, perhaps longer.

In talking with other canners at the recent national convention in Atlantic City the latter part of January, the above situation seems to be pretty general over the United States. Farm labor is still very scarce and unless we had purchased machinery and guaranteed to supply labor for harvest we would have had very limited acreage from 1943 on. However, canners have met this problem by recruiting labor for the farmer and by buying mechanical equipment for harvesting for the farmers' account. We believe your best source of information as to the general labor conditions on farms can be secured from canners because their problems are identical with the farmers. Considering the improving conditions, the steps which have already been taken to assist the farmer in his labor problems, and the inefficiency of the entire Department of Agriculture system for recruiting labor we see no reason to continue this program beyond the next 30 days.

The following comments were made by growers:

My opinion is, it costs too much. If we as taxpayers want the budget lowered we must cooperate, and I sure believe it should be reduced.

Another said:

It appears now that there is plenty of help available which is caused in most cases by industrial plants being temporarily closed for lack of raw materials. In our business, which is fruit growing, there could easily be a shortage of harvest help in the event there is a bumper crop. This, of course, remains to be seen.

Another said:

Our co-op will naturally need harvest help this year. Appreciate the help we have had from existing agency. But, the war is over. Emergency spending must stop. May as well stop here first.

Another grower said:

It is time to cut out some of the hangers-on. Let men work for their living. The men that are interested in seeing this program made permanent are the camp mongers, over supervisors, etc.; men who are drawing a good salary with no work. We think it is time to quit.

This man employed 30 farm workers for a period of 85 days each.

Another comment says:

A great many of the ex-servicemen are not applying for work until their \$20 a week runs out.

Another said:

Experience has taught us that persons drawing unemployment insurance will not go

out into the fields and pick string beans or tomatoes, or do work in the sweet-corn fields.

This one said:

The labor supply to date is very little better than during the past years. Too much money and boondoggling by Government has them spoiled. Not until many people realize that we have a duty, as well as a privilege, will it get better.

Another states:

We have found these workers only fair—got tired after a while—could not stand prosperity. We have advised local county agent we will not need their services again.

So far as my people are concerned they take the attitude that if we want to balance the budget and cut taxes we have got to cooperate. They want to go along on this thing of saving Government money and, as I stated, the only reason I am for this pending bill is because it is going to carry us through to the end of the crop year, then period. That is what all of my people want done that have answered my questionnaires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill, but I shall do so very reluctantly. I think that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made a very sound and forceful argument, and while I favor a continuation of this program for six additional months, I think that we should now sound a warning to the farmers who have utilized this imported labor that this program will not be made permanent and they cannot look to Congress in 1948 to provide them with the expensive labor which is provided by the pending bill.

As chairman of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture I had an opportunity to investigate the labor centers which have in the past housed this migratory labor in California, Texas, Arizona, and other parts of the country.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Does not the gentleman think that this warning should be directed to the State Department and not to the farmers, who do not want this system, and who have it imposed upon them; and does not the gentleman also think he should say that the farmers pay for this labor?

Mr. COOLEY. Of course, the farmers pay the prevailing wage, but if the farmers had to pay the cost of maintenance of the labor centers, including medical care and dental care and nursing in every form and fashion—

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They do pay most of it. In addition, they pay a stand-by charge when labor is not employed.

Mr. COOLEY. If the farmer is paying the cost of it, why do we have this bill pending in Congress?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Because the State Department has a contract with the Government of Mexico. That is the only way in which that labor is

permitted to work in the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, the Federal Government pays the cost.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The Federal Government pays the cost of administration.

Mr. COOLEY. I will ask my friend the gentleman from California if it is not a fact that foreign labor was imported into California to help in agriculture long before we ever had a Federal labor program?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. And the farmers then paid the cost of it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct.

Mr. COOLEY. While during the war the Federal Government has borne the enormous cost of maintaining these labor centers and transporting labor.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. They paid the railroad charges up and back.

Mr. COOLEY. And they paid the medical charge and dental care, and other costs.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The farmer paid a great deal of that and paid the cost when labor did not work. The farmer also paid for not working.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look at the estimates on the desk before him, he will find that there is an item contained therein for medical care and dental care.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is supervisory.

Mr. COOLEY. And these workers not only bring in themselves, but their families, and they have babies, and we provide medical care and attention for them.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. We do that anyway near the line.

Mr. COOLEY. You do what?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Near the line, the Mexican line, we do that anyway.

Mr. COOLEY. Another thing is the fact that in providing this labor, somebody in a responsible position went not to the Mexican border, but went 800 miles south of Mexico City to recruit the labor.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That was required by the Mexican Government. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. COOLEY. That is it; so they get a nice junket, a nice ride from 800 miles south of Mexico City to the city of Portland, Oreg., or some other far-distant point. That is an expensive program, there is no doubt about it. It may be needed, and I am voting for it this time, because I am willing to follow my committee in the belief that it is needed. But, are we faced with a situation that American labor is unwilling to till the fields of America and to cultivate the crops of America? If so, we better appoint a committee now to start preparing for a permanent labor program for the future.

I know that this is a burden that should be borne by the farmers themselves, or certainly by the States and the localities, and I believe that these labor centers which have been objectionable in many of the localities, and tremendously expensive, should be taken over. It would

be a good act on the part of Congress if we would give them away, give them to the States and let the States maintain them, because migratory labor is not a problem in all of the States of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In regard to this State Department argument that my friend from California has just raised, may I say that in order to get Mexican labor out of Mexico during the war the former Mexican Government insisted that they be brought in under certain contractual safeguards, with certain minimum wages and certain types of buildings that were to be furnished for them to live in while they were here.

Mr. COOLEY. And certain types of food had to be furnished.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The thing the gentleman from California is objecting to is that the private employers of labor are not allowed to go into Mexico and recruit them without any regard to minimum wages or their living conditions here.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. No; that is not a correct statement.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That course was followed before the contractual agreements were entered into.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to use a little of my time myself. One other reason I am for this bill is this: To date landlords throughout the country have not been able to obtain the necessary building materials to provide housing facilities for migratory labor. Within the next 6 months, or certainly within the next 12 months, the landlords of America should be ready, able, and willing to provide at least temporary quarters to house migratory labor. Otherwise they ought not to expect the Federal Government to dig down into the taxpayers' pockets to support the centers such as we have seen throughout the country. They are numerous and they are expensive. People ride into labor camps, park their cars, and move into quarters and take possession; and, according to our investigation, they were unwilling even to cut the weeds away from their front door, and when they did cut the weeds or grass around their little cottages they had to be paid for it out of the taxpayers' money. I think the time has come to stop it, and I hope it will be stopped at the end of this year.

It seems to me, that States in which migratory labor is a problem would welcome an opportunity to take over and to operate the labor camps and other facilities used in connection therewith, and to finance and maintain them. It also occurs to me that land owners engaged in cultivating large acreages, or even specialty crops, should be willing to provide housing facilities and other necessities for migratory labor which is so necessary in the harvesting season. Before shelters and camps were provided these

laborers slept and lived out in the open, on ditch banks and in other places. Wherever it is possible landlords should provide all-year employment for a sufficient number of laborers to enable them to harvest their crops. This situation of America families traveling from one end of the country to the other, following the harvest seasons, should not longer be tolerated. It is a problem of great magnitude and one which should arouse the people of the communities and States, in which it prevails. Foreign labor should not be imported except in the days of great emergency. The people of America should be encouraged to till the fields of America and to harvest the crops of their country. Certainly, no American will be encouraged to work in the fields if shelter and the bare necessities of life are not provided.

The attention of the Nation has been focused upon the desperate and distressing situation which has heretofore existed. May we hope that within the next year the people and the communities which have a great and personal financial interest in the crops to be harvested will get busy and do something about it, and thereby make it possible for the Federal Government to withdraw completely from activity in this field.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I believe that no man in this House, with the possible exception of the gentlemen from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER, Mr. SMITH, and Mr. JONES], have better voting records than I in the matter of doing away with useless expenditures, but I am supporting this bill because I think it is very necessary. It will not entail the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money.

Many of you who come from the Middle West have in the last couple of months received many letters like those I have received, telling me the writers had first-hand information, or they could prove, that great warehouses out in the Midwest were jam-packed full of sugar, while they could not get any sugar. They asked why the sugar was not distributed so the consumers, so the housewives, could get it. You looked into the matter just as I did and you found that that sugar was beet sugar which had just been processed, and that there will be no more beet sugar harvested or processed until next fall. That beet sugar has to be spread out so as to last us until the new crop comes in. We need sugar mighty bad, and everybody knows that, but I warn you that unless we make available this extra labor that is needed to produce beet sugar we are going to have an awfully short crop of beet sugar this fall. At the time when we look forward to getting plenty of sugar we will find the cupboard bare, and we will be no better off than we are today unless we do something about this matter and pass this legislation.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman can tell us approxi-

mately what it will cost to carry on and wind up this program in December 1947? What will be the over-all cost, approximately?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I cannot tell the gentleman that because nobody knows. They are beginning to get their applications in now. The operators of many of the canning factories throughout the Midwest tell me that many of them that had some of this labor before do not expect to use any of it this year, but there are places where they are absolutely dependent upon it, in the far West, and this is true particularly of the sugar and the canning factories.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman was a member of the committee that investigated the labor centers throughout the country. Does not the gentleman feel that at some time in the very near future the Federal Government should withdraw all of its support from the maintenance of these labor camps and centers throughout the country?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. They should do it, and if we give them this extension, they should have it done at that time.

Mr. COOLEY. That is, at the end of this year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. It will give an opportunity to these growers who want to buy these housing units and use them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. If we pass this bill, they will do it at the end of that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. I yield briefly.

Mr. GAVIN. May I ask the chairman of the committee if he can give us an estimate of the approximate cost of the job?

Mr. HOPE. A short time ago, when the chairman had the floor, he stated estimates from the Department of Agriculture showed that it would probably cost about \$10,000,000 to continue the program for an additional 6 months.

Mr. GAVIN. That will wind it up?

Mr. HOPE. That will wind it up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. May I add that this bill says it shall be liquidated and that is the purpose of this bill—to liquidate the program within this period. These canners are all dependent on peas, corn, and tomatoes, and if you know anything about it you would realize what these people are up against. Was it the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] awhile ago who said we are getting into an era—I do not know if those are his exact words—of unwillingness to work. We can lay that to the fault of this Congress if a great number of people would rather go along not working, for a smaller allowance, than work for a salary. These canneries are going to need those products, and we are going to need the canned vegetables. I know something about

that. They have to know something about it pretty quickly if they are going to get the crops in so that we will have enough corn, tomatoes, peas, and so forth. I was a grower of vegetables myself. I used to grow 20 acres of tomatoes right near Peoria, in the district of the gentleman from Illinois. The 20 acres of tomatoes were sold to a canning factory. We would have a contract by this time and the canning factory would agree to take all that we would produce, all at a stipulated price. The seed would be going into the ground now in that section of the country, that is, in hot beds, and they would be getting ready to transplant the seedlings to the fields. I am sure there will be little of that labor needed in central Illinois, but I do know in the far West and in California, where they do not have 20-acre plots, but have hundreds and thousands of acres, it will be necessary.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there was anyone more opposed to this proposal to extend authority to recruit farm labor outside the continental United States when it was brought before the committee than I was. I am only voting for the continuation of this legislation after listening to the pleas of farm organizations and others who have convinced me that it was necessary. The committee is aware of the objections to this legislation. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] expressed the view of nearly every member of the committee. But after listening to the farmers and those interested in this matter, we concluded and voted unanimously to continue this legislation for another 6 months. Then the legislation would be discontinued. As I said earlier, you are going to have this program in any event until midyear, that is, right in the middle of the crop year. Perhaps it would be more necessary to have this labor during the harvest than to have it during the planting time. For those reasons I am convinced that we should pass this legislation.

It has been observed that the State Department caused some of these contracts to be made. It must be recognized that the State Department makes a contract with another country.

I would have very little regard for the Republic of Mexico if they did not make some requirements of this country and not allow this country to go down there and indiscriminately take nationals from their country and not guarantee to give them some protection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not also true that the farm organizations came before the State Department and advocated that they make such an agreement because they knew that was the only way they could get the labor out of Mexico?

Mr. GRANGER. Certainly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And to attack the State Department is entirely unwarranted?

Mr. GRANGER. I think so, too. I do not subscribe to the statements that were made about it.

Furthermore, there seems to be much said about New Deal legislation. I am a farmer who went broke during those glorious days when we did not have New Deal legislation. I want to say the only decent legislation that has ever helped the farmer has been New Deal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI].

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I do not have a farmer in my district but I have got a lot of labor and a lot of consumers of food. I think this bill means more food at cheaper prices, and I am going to vote for it.

I saw the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary in the chamber a few minutes ago. I want to bring this letter to the attention of the House. It is signed by the chairman of the committee, and it states:

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: During each session of the Congress the Government is put to a great deal of embarrassment and expense through the introduction of private bills relating to immigration and naturalization.

The committee is aware that in many cases your Department stays deportation proceedings and is otherwise harassed because of the mere introduction of these bills. We feel this situation is in need of correction.

Accordingly, unless the committee addresses some formal communication to you after the introduction of any such bill or bills, you may feel free to disregard the practice of staying deportation proceedings.

This letter is written pursuant to a resolution passed by the House Judiciary Committee at a session this morning and is not a letter of the chairman but is the letter of the committee.

Now, since when has the Judiciary Committee usurped that authority? What sort of meat do they feed on that they have become so great? Does the average Member of the House have no standing any more? Have some of these people gone power-mad because they have been out of power for 14 years? The chairman of my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] permits every Member to come over there. He has invited them to come and appear on their bills. That is how fair we are. But here is a committee that does not invite you to appear on your bill, it does not give you an opportunity, but sends a letter to the department telling them, in effect, "You go ahead and deport a man" when you have a bill to stay proceedings, and it is a hardship case. I want to ask the Speaker of the House if he authorized this action and if he did, I am going to appeal to the President of the United States to tell the Attorney General not to permit any such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to foreign labor if it was at all possible to harvest the crops without it. The farmers do not wish to have farm laborers imported to harvest their crops. I can remember many years ago when we brought foreigners from various countries, but since that time rules and regulations have forbidden the individual farmer to make a deal for himself. Conditions have changed today. The farmer is called upon to provide housing for farm laborers different from that provided many years ago. For that reason the farmer in the past has not been able to obtain sufficient material to provide decent quarters for the average farmer and his family to live in. Mexican nationals can be brought in and housed in quarters where 150 or 200 single men can be kept together. You cannot do that with American labor. The cost of harvesting various types of fruit with foreign labor is from \$3.50 to \$6 a ton more than when harvested by our own American laborers.

This is not the big landowners' problem as some have said here today. Many small farmers, during the war period and at the present time, would be unable to harvest their crops if sufficient labor were not supplied from some other source. Farm-labor camps and labor camps with foreign laborers make it possible for the small farmer to call at the camp and transport to and from his farm the number of men needed to harvest his crops. Our American laborers are just not available to work on the farms. It is impossible in my section to have the cotton picked in the fall of the year without some outside help, as it cannot be obtained locally. And in the peak of the fruit season when you have on hot days—and I wish to mention that the temperature might run from 102 to 110—you have millions of tons of fruit in my State to be harvested in a period of 10 days to 2 weeks' time, depending on the type of crop. You must make arrangements in advance. We know that the labor must be brought in to be there at the time that crop is going to ripen.

I can say to you most sincerely that it is not the wish of the farmers to bring in Mexican nationals, but they are forced to. They wish the people of this country would raise their boys to want to be farmers and go out on the farms. That is what I would like to see happen today. Instead of that we see young men leaving the farms when they grow up. The modern young man does not want to go out and work the long hours one has to work on the farm to make a living. So our farmers who are using this foreign labor are doing something they do not want to do. Some say that that is what the big farmer wants is cheap labor. That is not the case. It costs more to use that kind of labor than it does to work our own American laborers. I have employed some of them of different nationalities. I have employed Japs, Chinamen, Mexicans, Hindus, and people of practically every race

there is, but they do not seem to get the job done like our own American boys. So certainly it is not cheap labor; it is most expensive labor.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman feel that after all it is a problem of the States and localities rather than of the Federal Government to provide for the importation, support, and maintenance of these people while they are here?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will agree with the gentleman that perhaps it is the duty of the State and in some instances of the communities to provide this labor, but with the labor supply taken away from us like it has been and with our being refused materials to provide homes how can we attract American labor? We today are not doing our duty to see that material is made available to the farmers with which they can provide homes on their farms. You cannot criticize the young man for not wanting to take his wife on a farm and expect her to live in a tent, yet that is the way a lot of this labor has to live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(Mr. ELLIOTT and Mr. COOLEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, it would be impossible to discuss a question like this in 5 minutes, but I would like to mention some angles I think Members who have spoken failed to consider. First of all, the war itself and its direct effect on farm labor was absolutely terrific in my section. They took our farm boys and they still were taking them last September. And then you tell me the war is over and the effect on agricultural products in my territory is not being felt. We are still living under war-time conditions in many sections of Colorado.

Let me call attention to another thing. We do not live close to these great centers where you can get help on a moment's notice from the ranks of the unemployed. We have to bring them a long, long ways, and we cannot get the help in when we need it unless we have some type of organization to bring it in.

Let me say that this war not only took our farm boys but it came into our territory, and renters and even farm owners quit the farms and moved into the large industrial centers where they felt they could make more money in 6 months or a year than they could in a lifetime on a farm.

Here is another thing. We could not help it. No one is to blame. Neither the Democratic Party nor the Republican Party. No one is to blame. These are conditions over which man has no power. But let us analyze another element. Some one mentioned farm implements. Let me say that we could not even buy farm implement repairs, and they are scarce even today. I heard someone here say: "Let us look at this great volume of farm implements in relation to the amount of money you spend

for farm implements." That does not mean a thing unless you manufacture the small equipment that is necessary for the average farm. The farm implements are not here and the supply will not be on hand in 1947; do not forget that; so it is not only manpower these farms need, it is machinery. If you will give us in the beet industry 5 to 7 years we will have it completely mechanized. We are working toward that end.

This bill does not concern itself with the remarks that were made by two gentlemen on the floor of this House. This bill concerns temporary help—not permanent. These men come in quickly, as the gentleman from California who just preceded me told you. He could just as well have said, too, that unless that help comes in immediately, unless that help is there when the crop is ready, it is absolutely a complete and total loss in many cases. I direct your attention to green beans, where a few days will make it impossible for those green beans to be canned. The same applies to many of the other vegetables, such as red beets, sweet corn, tomatoes, and a whole list of vegetables.

We heard testimony that if he could not get help when the vegetables were ready to pick and bring them into the cannery, the whole community would have to change their farm operations.

I am surprised that some of you gentlemen oppose this legislation. Let us see who is for the legislation. The best processors appeared and gave their testimony. There was a whole list of them that I put in the record. The beet farmer himself says he must have this type of legislation. He needs it for the coming 6 months. Then we can drop the whole program at the end of that time. We do not want any outside help if we can find our own labor within the Nation. The canning industry appeared and gave us some real testimony as to why we need this temporary foreign labor. The Department of Agriculture appeared before us in support of this legislation. Regardless of what a gentleman said to you previously, I tell you that the county agricultural agent knows where these men are needed, and if the great State of Pennsylvania has the kind of county agents that the gentleman says they have up there, it is about time that the great State of Pennsylvania fire some of their county agents and come out to California, Colorado, or Wyoming, some of our Western States, and get men who know how to handle a county agent's job. There is not a county agent in our State who does not know when his farmers need extra help.

In closing let me say that the farm organizations appeared before us, and they are for this temporary legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I want to make the observation that while a county agent may not know what he wants, the farmers do.

Mr. HILL. The county agent knows what the farmers want because the farmers have confidence in him and approve of his program.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If the program is as good as the gentleman has outlined it to us, why does the committee recommend that it be terminated in December 1947?

Mr. HILL. No one said this is a good program. We say this is a temporary program, as I told the committee a minute ago that this is a temporary program and applies to temporary help only.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason to read any political question into this problem. From the beginning of this particular program, it has always been brought to the House from the Committee on Agriculture practically by unanimous consent. Today I commend the committee for what it has done in bringing this legislation to the House. I justify this program not for any theoretical reasons but for very practical ones. The beginning of it and the continuation of it are justified on the basis of necessity, and not otherwise. Those who today draw a picture of the farmers of the country wanting this program in order to get cheap labor are presenting a picture not faithful to the facts. That is not the motive behind this legislation.

As indicated by one or two previous speakers, it is decidedly more expensive for the farmers to use this foreign labor than it is the domestic supply. They would like to get rid of the program as soon as other taxpayers of the country.

But I have seen the operation of this program in our State. Much of the production in California of food products, vegetables as well as fruits, is upon a wholesale mass production basis. Last year California produced the largest canned crop of both vegetables and fruits that was ever produced. Those products are needed by this country and by the countries that we are trying to aid in the distressed situation of the world. I can say to you as a practical fact that a substantial part of that production of fruits and vegetables would never have gone to the canners if it had not been for this means of providing labor to assist the American farmer who produced it. It is literally true that millions of dollars' worth of such foods in the past 3 years have been produced with the help of this imported labor. Again, I want to emphasize the fact that it is costing the farmers more than domestic labor. There is still a definite prospect that there is not going to be an adequate supply of domestic labor this year.

Within the last week the Governor of California was here and it has been revealed that California today has more labor employment than it had in the peak of war production. Now, with that situation before us the consumers of the country must realize that, if this program is not continued, they are likely going to have a less supply of the necessary

food products in this country for the coming year.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

(Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, surprised at the opposition to this bill to provide needed farm labor for the West. Believe me, I would not be here fighting for the passage of this measure if it was not vitally needed.

I have heard many cries of distress because we do not have enough sugar. Yet if you defeat this bill, you will take away from the beet growers in my State of Montana the only means by which they can harvest this very needed crop.

When I plead for this legislation I do so on the basis of my unhappy experiences over the past 4 years in getting labor for the sugar-beet fields of Montana. My farmers do not want a continuation of this type of labor any longer than necessary, but they do want this labor until a permanent farm labor program is inaugurated and until they can mechanize their fields as much as possible.

My only thought is that this legislation is needed now to give assurance to our sugar-beet farmers so that they can have some assurance for the crop year ahead.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this legislation merely extends this beneficial program to the end of the calendar year and corrects the difficulty so often encountered with our appropriations by fiscal years. These end, of course, on June 30, the very middle of the crop season.

It is also worthy of note that, since the program is already lined up and commitments made, only a small percentage of savings would be made.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, my district is the Eastern Shore of Maryland. It has been said that our section is allergic to foreigners—that we are self-sufficient and look upon strangers with suspicion. Be that as it may, the laborers that have been imported under the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act may not have been the most desirable class of laborers, and it may well be that we would like to be able to do without them, but for this coming crop season they are an unpleasant necessity.

My district is in many ways a huge food factory. The farmers, packers, and watermen produce a huge quantity of fine food, fresh, frozen, and canned vegetables, fruits, and seafoods, and our bottleneck comes at the time that this food must be harvested or packed and preserved for the market.

I sincerely hope that a sound plan of providing necessary labor to take care of

the peak loads may be worked out in future years so that, with adequate machinery, local labor—or at least American labor—will be sufficient to meet our needs. It would, however, be a calamity if we were unable to save our crops and supply the hungry mouths of the world this, particular year. The bill under consideration, if passed, will not change the situation in the midst of a crop year and at the same time it serves notice that the present plan will be liquidated by the end of 1947.

For these reasons, I urge the passage of the bill.

(Mr. MILLER of Maryland asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I did not know until this bill got on the floor that it was a political question. I know that, as far as my own side was concerned, nearly every Member was opposed to the bill in the form in which it first appeared in the committee. However, most of us have to change our positions some and make agreements to work for the common good. There is not any question but what sugar production in 1947 and canned vegetables for 1947 are dependent on this legislation. California and the sugar-beet areas of the West are very dependent on this legislation.

This legislation was considered very carefully in the committee. The situation just brought out by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], was presented. When we realize that the State of California produces about 20 percent of the vegetables in the United States and has to put them into cans, then I think we begin to appreciate what the problem is.

We have a timetable on this program now, which we did not have when it came into the committee. This whole business is over with on January 1. I want it to appear in the RECORD at this point that should it happen to have a bad reception in some other body and it comes back here with anything on it beyond January 1, 1948, I do not want to be a party to it. I can assure every person here that we have tried to bring this in as a compromise.

It was brought out this morning that the Government is spending five or six billion dollars renegotiating with the business firms of this country after the war. How much money we are going to spend, whether three, four, five, up to ten million dollars, to renegotiate the farm labor problem, is for you to judge and decide.

We have plenty of confidence that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with his eagle eye, will not let any money be wasted on this program this year, but we trust that he will have an approach that will not deny the needed labor to any group. If we are going to follow any-

where near the food commitments that are being made, and perhaps being made rather loosely, to the peoples of this world, that we are going to feed them, I guess it would be pretty good public policy to go along with this labor program at least until January 1, 1948.

While I have always felt that if these additional funds were given to American workmen sufficient domestic labor could be secured, I am willing to go along with the distinct understanding that the program terminates January 1, 1948. I mean January 1, 1948.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such act, may be continued for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That such program shall be liquidated by December 31, 1947. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until 6 months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier." Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DIRKSEN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I assure the members of the committee that I find no particular felicity in the position that I feel constrained to take upon this and upon certain other legislation, but let me admonish you now that it is only a few days ago that this House by a resounding action imposed a ceiling on expenditures \$6,000,000,000 below the President's budget, which was subsequently reduced to \$4,500,000,000 by another body. In the middle of this week the conferees from both bodies will meet to join the issue. It is not an easy job, I assure you gentlemen, to find \$6,000,000,000, but I think we can do it. But when you add to that burden the job of finding money for this expenditure, and perhaps others, I assure you it becomes an immeasurably more difficult task. Only a few days ago a measure passed this House to provide a program with respect to the hoof-and-mouth disease at an estimated cost of \$60,000,000. My own estimate of what this will cost is at least \$15,000,000. The maximum in other years was about \$26,000,000.

The Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be a member, has thus far appropriated \$113,000,000 for this purpose since fiscal 1944. So, remember, there is a ceiling, and it is the responsibility of every individual to carefully scrutinize every bill which seeks to appropriate or authorize the appropriation of money.

There is no estimate for this in the President's budget. Examine the budget when you get back to your offices, and you will find that the last estimate was for the fiscal year 1947. What is proposed here today is the lifting of the budget of the President of the United States after we made a determined effort here 2 weeks ago to impose a ceiling on expenditures. Does the action then taken have no significance for us now?

The question was raised here of breaking faith with the farmers. It was raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]. The law is just as plain as print can be that the cut-off date for this law was June 30, 1947. There is no breaking faith with the farmers. The farm organizations and their legislative representatives know that the program was to end in June. They know what it means when an act says it shall end on June 30, 1947. That is what we said to the farmers last year. So, where is the element of lack of faith or betrayal involved on the part of Congress?

They say this is a short program of 6 months to provide for liquidation. Is it going to be a liquidation program? Here is a letter from the Farm Bureau Federation addressed to a Senator from Illinois. It was written on the 19th of February 1947. With respect to this bill, it says:

Yes; we favor a 6-month extension for this purpose, with a provision for 90-day liquidation of the farm workers' program after that date.

And, further:

We are also working on a permanent farm labor program to be carried out through the extension service.

This bill must go to another body. They will have a whack at it. It will come back here after a conference and thus may well become the springboard for a permanent program that will cost the people millions of dollars from here on out.

Gentlemen, do not be disillusioned, deceived, or dismayed by the representation that it is necessarily a temporary sort of business because I have been through that mill before. I aided in ending farm crop insurance here on this floor once—and I say it with all modesty—but the whole program was written back into the appropriation bill over in the other body. Today, it is in effect, and the losses through indemnities on some items are greater than they ever were. Make no mistake about it. Now then, here is a preferential motion to test the sentiment of the committee. Do you want it or do you not? But, remember, permanency is lurking right around the corner.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is to liquidate the farm-labor program. The gentle-

man from Illinois can be assured, and I know I am speaking for those who will be on the conference committee, that if there are amendments adopted in the Senate, changing this to a permanent program, the conferees on the part of the House will not agree to them in conference. We intend to keep this as a liquidation bill, and I know of no disposition in the other body to modify this bill by setting up a permanent program.

There is such a thing as being penny wise and pound foolish. This bill is going to cost a little money. The Department of Agriculture says \$10,000,000. The distinguished gentleman from Illinois, of course, as the chairman of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations is going to be the man who will determine how much it will cost. We all have enough confidence in him to know there is not going to be any money wasted on this program.

Now let me call your attention to some of the testimony before the committee as to just how necessary and important this program is. Here is a paragraph from a letter from the Minnesota Canners' Association. Minnesota is one of the largest of our canning-crop States. It reads as follows:

As an illustration, in Minnesota alone in 1946, 90 percent of the sweet corn, 70 percent of the peas, and 90 percent of the other canning crops were harvested by this imported labor.

Then it goes on to say that unless this labor is available this year their operation cannot be carried out. They cannot make contracts with their producers. They say the need is as great this year as it was last year.

Let me read to you from the testimony of Josiah Ferris, representing the United States Sugar Corp. of Clewiston, Fla. He says:

If we are unable to continue the use of the foreign labor we now have in our employ, approximately 3,000 Jamaicans and Barbadians, we will be unable to harvest and process our 1947-48 crop, which will mean in sugar to the housewives of America a loss of about 200,000,000 pounds.

Let me call attention to the statement of Colonel Buel, who is director of foreign labor program in the Department of Agriculture. He says:

We worked 22,000 Mexicans in the great sugar beet harvest last fall. In other words, 22,000 Mexicans harvested 35 percent of the sugar beets, representing approximately \$130,000,000.

Every Member of this House has had letters from housewives wanting to know when they are going to get more sugar. If we refuse to pass this legislation out of a sense of false economy, what are you going to tell them when they write to you next year? Are you going to say, "We did not have the foresight a year ago to provide the farmers with enough labor to plant and harvest the sugar beet crop, so we are short"? Yet, I am sure that there is no one, after hearing the discussion on this floor today, who is not convinced that it is absolutely necessary to have this legislation if we are going to produce the sugar that we need in this country, or if we are going to have the canned fruits and vegetables

that we need if we are going to feed our people.

I hope the committee will vote down the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] by an overwhelming majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the preferential motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 32, noes 105.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I merely rise, as our old friend from New York used to say, in the interest of the record.

We are working at the present moment on an extension. Had we not had one 6 months' extension this thing would have been all wrapped up in mothballs and forgotten on the 31st day of last December. Last spring when this measure was due to expire in December representation was made to us that it would be necessary to get all of these aliens out of the country by the 31st of December and that they might be taken out of the beet fields right in the middle of the harvesting season. I was a member of the committee that went down to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture and others about it. We went down asking him for an extension to give them time to assure that the beet crop would be harvested. Somewhat against my own impulses and only in the interest of being assured that the beet crop would be taken in I went along and was a member of this party. So this thing was continued until June 30. I was for March 1 but my views did not prevail. We are now here with an extension on an extension to make this thing live through the calendar year 1947.

I shall perhaps vote for this bill. Out in my country we raise some tomatoes. They may be vegetables in some of your districts but up in northern and western Ohio where we raise them they are fruit. Some of you may have seen a ton of tomatoes. A ton of tomatoes is a lot of tomatoes, and a thousand tons of tomatoes is a lot of tomatoes. Well, they raised 125,000 tons in my district last year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Coming from a city district it seems to me that the proponents of this bill in the emergency that exists have made out a clear case justifying it not only for the farmer but also in the interest of the country, the consumer as well.

Mr. CLEVINGER. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am coming to that right now. As I said before, 125,000 tons of tomatoes is a lot of tomatoes; and the sugar beets are there also, and we have feather-bedded employment—there is no question about it. Until we get tough enough to do as old John Smith did down in the James River peninsula when some of the gentlemen at Jamestown said that their hands were not toughened to the ax, they

were informed that if they did not chop they would not eat.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman believe we have pretty well taken care of that situation by the amendment in section 2 of this bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I think so; and I am voting for this bill only with the assurance from my chairman that this thing is dead and is going to be embalmed and buried.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] just read from the testimony of Mr. Ferris, vice president of the United States Sugar Corp., that they would not be able to continue their program unless they could have the benefit of the 3,000 Jamaicans and Barbadoans they employ on their plantation at Clewiston, Fla. There is an old saying: We should put the oil where the squeak is. A few years ago I had the opportunity and pleasure of going over this entire sugar plantation at Clewiston. They have a development there so large that they had to bring in thousands of Negroes and build many villages on the plantation for them.

One of the conditions that surrounds this whole problem is due to what happened right on that big plantation. A few years ago the New Deal administration said to the United States Sugar Corp. at Clewiston, Fla.: "You will have to cut down the acreage you have under cultivation by over half." What did that do? It threw thousands and thousands of these colored employees out of work and they immediately went on the dole. Then when the sugar situation got acute and they wanted these colored people to go back to work on this plantation they refused to do so. They would not go back to work. This is one of the reasons they have had to resort to the importation of foreign labor.

Mr. Chairman, this is as good a time as any to start redeeming our campaign pledge to cut down Government expenditures, and particularly subsidies. This is a double subsidy bill. It is a subsidy on the program provided in the bill, and it is a subsidy on people drawing unemployment compensation who are not willing to work.

It has been stated that this is a temporary bill. It extends subsidies 6 months. If we do not extend it 6 months subsidies die on June 30 of this year. If you do extend it 6 months this is going to give the crowd who wants subsidies 6 months longer to drum up a permanent proposition. There is not a thing in the world to prevent them from coming to the floor of this House at the beginning of the second session of the Congress and introducing legislation identical to this. How can anyone say it is temporary? It

is time to start reducing Government expenditures and redeeming our campaign pledges. This is an excellent place to start.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. If we vote this bill down today, there is nothing to keep anyone from introducing the same bill in the second session of the Congress, is there?

Mr. BUSBEY. It gives them 6 months longer to cook up another bill.

Mr. HOPE. They will have the same 6 months whether we kill it or pass it.

Mr. BUSBEY. If we are going to start cutting, we better start now. Day after day you are going to have bill after bill come in here that a special group will want passed. If you were sincere last fall during the campaign, when you promised the people you were going to cut expenditures, you will vote against this resolution.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder what the corporation to which the gentleman refers is going to do next year. Does the gentleman have anything to suggest as to what position they will be in?

Mr. BUSBEY. What did they do before they imported this labor?

Mr. GAVIN. Evidently they got along all right.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the people who originally worked this plantation are not willing to go back there and work, while we have 2,000,000 unemployed in this country, and we have to subsidize imported labor, the people of this country should be told the truth about it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] estimates this extension will cost approximately \$15,000,000. The people of this country are demanding a cut in income taxes. It will be difficult to give it to them if we pass resolutions like this one, especially when it is not even asked for in the President's budget.

It is time we stop playing politics and vote our convictions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, this is important legislation not only to the agriculture of my State but to the sugar consumers of the whole country. In 1945 we produced 871,000 tons of sugar in Montana. Last year we produced about 1,000,000 tons.

If this bill is passed today it will encourage the beet growers of my State to produce another million tons of sugar for use in this country. In order to produce a million tons of sugar last year we had last spring some 4,000 prisoners of war and some 2,500 Mexican nationals.

Those prisoners left about July 1. In the fall of the year we had between 3,000 and 3,500 Mexicans to harvest that crop. We only harvested the crop with the greatest of handicaps due to early fall snow and other difficulties. Those beet

growers were very discouraged before that crop was finally harvested. Now, if we do not give them some assurance of a labor supply to harvest this year's crop they are not going to grow that million tons, and it will be a serious thing to the whole country.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Have you any other source of labor to enable your people to grow this million tons of beet sugar this year?

Mr. D'EWART. We do not have sufficient labor in our State.

Mr. JENNINGS. Then you are dependent upon the passage of this bill to get it.

Mr. D'EWART. We have to have the assurance of this labor if we are going to grow that million tons.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Would the gentleman be able to say the same thing about 1948, 1949, and 1950?

Mr. D'EWART. We sincerely hope not. We hope to mechanize that crop out there so that we can produce it by machinery.

I have here a letter that I would like to quote from very briefly from a processor in my State which throws some light on this situation:

Nearly everyone I contact in this particular district is asking when they can expect more sugar to be granted the household user as well as the commercial user.

The feeling regarding sugar beet growing in 1947 is quite good at the present time. As yet we do not have a contract to present the growers. However, I anticipate signing a good acreage for this factory this year. The question in the minds of nearly all of the growers is the one we have had in past years, "What about the labor situation?" I learn now that the permanent labor program has been sidetracked for the time being and that efforts are now being put forth to extend the present bill another 6 months to December 31.

The sugar beet industry as a whole was quite disappointed to learn that at a meeting held in Chicago on January 13, the implement manufacturers would be unable to supply the harvesters that could be sold this year. It seems that steel is one of the big bottlenecks in implement manufacture, and bearings are even more of a problem, with the result that the manufacturers plan to build only about one-fourth of the harvesting machines that the sugar beet industry feels would be needed.

The sugar beet growers are taking to the mechanization program very rapidly; and I am quite sure that if more machines were made available all of them would be placed with sugar beet growers. Now that we know these machines are not going to be built we must again plan to carry on with hand labor, although with a lesser number than in former years.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from the report on the sugar situation issued by our subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, dated February 1. That committee said:

The committee feels that steps should now be taken to assure abundant sugar production in the United States, including Hawaii and Puerto Rico, for use by the American

people in 1948. Adequate supplies of fertilizer, labor, and machinery should be provided sugar-beet and sugar-cane growers, as well as a satisfactory incentive to secure maximum production in all United States sugar-producing areas. The time to plan for sugar supplies for use in 1948 is at hand. Failure to do so can only mean continued shortages of sugar.

This statement goes on to say that labor is necessary. I sincerely hope that this bill will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act—
(a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 124, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 140, noes 39.

Mr. HOLFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-nine Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 243, nays 110, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—243

Abernethy	Gearhart	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Gillette	Miller, Conn.
Allen, Calif.	Goff	Miller, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Gordon	Mills
Allen, La.	Gore	Monroney
Almond	Gorski	Morris
Anderson, Calif.	Gossett	Morton
Andresen,	Graham	Muhlenberg
August H.	Granger	Mundt
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ala.	Murdock
Andrews, N. Y.	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Angell	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Arends	Hagen	Norblad
Arnold	Hale	Norman
Auchincloss	Hall	Pace
Barrett	Edwin Arthur	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Hall	Patman
Bates, Mass.	Leonard W.	Patterson
Battle	Halleck	Peden
Beall	Hand	Peterson
Beckworth	Hardy	Phillips, Calif.
Bell	Harless, Ariz.	Phillips, Tenn.
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Pickett
Blatnik	Harris	Preston
Boggs, Del.	Harrison	Price, Fla.
Boggs, La.	Hart	Price, Ill.
Bolton	Hedrick	Priest
Boykin	Hendricks	Rayburn
Bradley, Calif.	Herter	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Rees
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Reeves
Brooks	Hobbs	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Riley
Brown, Ohio	Holmes	Rizley
Bryson	Hope	Robertson
Burke	Horan	Robison
Burleson	Howell	Rockwell
Cannon	Jackson, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.
Carroll	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Mass.
Carson	Jarman	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Sadlak
Chadwick	Jenison	Sadowski
Chapman	Jennings	St. George
Chelf	Johnson, Calif.	Sanborn
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Sasscer
Clason	Johnson, Ind.	Scrivner
Clevenger	Johnson, Okla.	Seely-Brown
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Sheppard
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Simpson, Ill.
Cooley	Jones, Ohio	Smathers
Cooper	Karsten, Mo.	Smith, Kans.
Cotton	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Courtney	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Kilburn	Snyder
Crawford	Kilday	Spence
Dague	King	Springer
D'Alesandro	Knutson	Stefan
Davis, Ga.	Lanham	Stigler
Dawson, Utah	Lea	Stockman
Deane	LeCompte	Stratton
D'Ewart	LeFevre	Taber
Dingell	Lemke	Tallie
Dolliver	Lewis	Teague
Domenegeaux	Lucas	Thomas, Tex.
Dorn	Lusk	Thomason
Doughton	Lyle	Tibbott
Drewry	McConnell	Trimble
Elliott	McCormack	Weichel
Ellsworth	McDonough	Welch
Engel, Mich.	McGregor	West
Evins	McMillan, S. C.	Wheeler
Fallon	Mahon	Whitten
Fellows	Manasco	Whittington
Fernandez	Mansfield	Williams
Fisher	Mont	Wilson, Tex.
Flannagan	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Fletcher	Mathews	Wolverton
Folger	Meade, Ky.	Wood
Foote	Meade, Md.	Worley
Forand	Morrow	Zimmerman
Fulton	Meyer	
Gary	Michener	

NAYS—110

Andersen,	Brehm	Canfield
H. Carl	Brophy	Chipherfield
Bakewell	Buchanan	Church
Banta	Buck	Clark
Bender	Buffett	Cole, Mo.
Bennett, Mich.	Busbey	Corbett
Bennett, Mo.	Butler	Coudert
Bishop	Byrnes, Wis.	Crosser

Crow	Judd	Plumley
Cunningham	Kean	Potts
Delaney	Kearney	Rabin
Devitt	Kearns	Rains
Dirksen	Keating	Rankin
Douglas	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
Durham	Kelley	Rich
Ellis	Kersten, Wis.	Riehlman
Elsaesser	Kirwan	Rohrbough
Fenton	Klein	Rooney
Fogarty	Kunkel	Ross
Gamble	Latham	Russell
Gavin	Lodge	Sarbacher
Gifford	Love	Schwabe, Mo.
Goodwin	Lynch	Schwabe, Okla.
Grant, Ind.	McCowan	Shafer
Griffiths	McMahon	Smith, Ohio
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Havener	MacKinnon	Sundstrom
Heffernan	Madden	Thomas, N. J.
Heseltun	Maloney	Tollefson
Hoffman	Marcantonio	Towe
Hollifield	Mason	Twyman
Huber	Morgan	Van Zandt
Hull	Nodar	Vorys
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Brien	Walter
Jensen	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Jones, Wash.	O'Toole	Winstead
Jonkman	Owens	Youngblood

NOT VOTING—79

Barden	Gathings	Pfeifer
Bland	Gerlach	Philbin
Bloom	Gillie	Ploeser
Bonner	Gwynne, Iowa	Poage
Buckley	Hartley	Poulson
Bulwinkle	Hays	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Hébert	Ramey
Camp	Hess	Rayfiel
Case, N. J.	Jenkins, Pa.	Redden
Celler	Kee	Rivers
Clements	Kennedy	Scoblick
Clippinger	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Cole, N. Y.	Landis	Scott,
Combs	Lane	Hugh D., Jr.
Cox	Larcade	Short
Curtis	Lesinski	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Somers
Dawson, Ill.	McGarvey	Stanley
Dondero	Macy	Stevenson
Donohue	Mansfield, Tex.	Taylor
Eaton	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Eberharter	Mitchell	Vinson
Elston	Morrison	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Nixon	Wadsworth
Feighan	Norrell	Wilson, Ind.
Fuller	Norton	Woodruff
Gallagher	O'Hara	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Vursell for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Nixon for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Bonner for, with Mr. Rayfiel against.

Mr. Kee for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Donohue for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Macy with Mr. Feighan.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Engle of California.

Mr. Woodruff with Mr. Poage.

Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Bland.

Mr. Hess with Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Short with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Buckley.

Mr. Dondero with Mr. Lane.

Mr. Fuller with Mr. Morrison.

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Philbin.

Mr. McDowell with Mrs. Norton.

Mr. Clippinger with Mr. Redden.

Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Gillie with Mr. Combs.

Mr. Elston with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Curtis with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Landis with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. O'Hara with Mr. Bulwinkle.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Ploesser with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SEA-AIR TRANSPORTATION—WHY NOT?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee is to strive to maintain the American merchant marine paramount on the high seas. For many years the most progressive elements of the American merchant marine have been seeking to utilize overseas aircraft in conjunction with steamships for the purpose of coordinating the two facilities and providing the public with an integrated and improved transportation service. Congress itself gave energy to this program by incorporating in section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, a provision which authorizes and directs the Maritime Commission to cooperate with vessel owners in devising means by which transoceanic aircraft service may be used in connection with or in lieu of steamships. Following that authorization, great progress was made in planning the use of flying boats in conjunction with steamships.

When the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 was adopted, the steamship lines, having been assured that the act gave them the right to enter the air transport field on the basis of equality with any other person, stepped up their plans for the establishment of coordinated sea and air services.

In creating the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Congress provided a national policy for the regulation of aeronautics and the development of a sound economic and adequate transportation system by air—properly adapted to the

needs of the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of national defense. The ultimate objectives of this policy are identical with those prescribed for the Maritime Commission for the development of our American merchant marine.

But, under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, no steamship company can operate in overseas or foreign air commerce until a certificate of convenience and necessity has been issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In its decisions the Board has held that this act "rigidly limits the participation of the older forms of transportation in the air-transport field." It interpreted a section of the act as extremely restrictive and only those limited air-transport services which are auxiliary and supplementary to other transport operations and which are therefore incidental thereto can meet the conditions laid down by that proviso.

We in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee have heretofore been helpless in coping with the Civil Aeronautics Board, inasmuch as all legislation pertaining to its activities is assigned to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Consequently, last week, I introduced House Resolution 109 for the purposes of amending the rules of the House so that measures concerning the operation of aircraft by shipping companies over their own shipping routes would be referred to our committee. We are most hopeful that this resolution will be enacted so that we can get to the bottom of the sea-air controversy and set the Civil Aeronautics Board straight on this issue once and for all.

While we here in America are denying to our merchant marine the right to operate transoceanic aircraft service, our world-wide competitors are reaping the cream of the crop. Our Civil Aeronautics Board, pursuant to commendable bilateral agreements with other countries, has readily granted overseas air permits to 15 foreign lines and is obligated to grant a possible 19 more. Negotiations are in progress with 13 others. The most active and important of these are in one way or another controlled or dominated by foreign subsidized steamship interests. We are favoring foreigners instead of Americans in this instance.

The CAB in actual practice has excluded, on major routes, all air applicants which did not exist at the time of its inception, permitting those fortunate companies then existent—such as Pan American, TWA, and American Airlines—to build themselves through the war years into vast networks and granting to them alone the right to fly overseas. Our entire domestic American air transport business is being monopolized by a total of only 28 certificated air lines and practically all of our overseas air commerce is being conducted by only six certificated air lines. The Big Four of these companies do 66 percent of the total domestic business.

Contrast the above with the fact that there are over 143 steamship companies engaged in carrying our domestic and foreign water-borne trade—with no artificial barriers to new entries in foreign commerce.

The fact that the steamship lines are the only ones with the management, finances, and overseas organizations to adequately protect American foreign trade seems to escape the Civil Aeronautics Board. Also the Board apparently has not awakened to the tragic fact that their monopolistic grants to these favored few air-line companies are probably the "kiss of death" for some of them. It is well known that the domestic air lines are making an unholy mess of their business—many of you may have read the article in Fortune magazine last August entitled "What's Wrong With the Air Lines," or the article in the Saturday Evening Post for October 19, 1946, entitled "Why Air Passengers Get Mad," and there have been numerous others. It will obviously take every ounce of energy that the domestic air lines can muster to put their tottering house in order. To, at this time, saddle them with the difficult job of developing the complicated pattern of our overseas foreign trade is leading them to disaster through financial and managerial over-expansion. The overseas job is simply asking too much of them—first, because they are overtaxed at home; second, because of their lack of experience in foreign trade; and, third, because of the intense and experienced competition being brought to bear by our foreign competitors.

While we are on this subject let us remember, also, that it has been the business of the United States flag steamship companies to maintain contact men, agents, and establishments not only in Europe but throughout the ports and inland cities of the world since the days of the clipper ships and the China trade. It still is, and these facilities exist today. It is this 100 years of knowledge and assets that our CAB to date has ignored in dividing the trade and travel zones of half the world among these favored few air lines, of which but one—Pan American—enjoyed any direct previous overseas experience; the second—American—bought out a ship company's air line to enter the market the CAB had given it, and the third began world-wide services with no prior foreign commercial experience at all.

To appreciate the tragic economic significance of the exclusion of ship lines from world air trade, it must be remembered that passenger traffic on American-flag vessels ceased with Pearl Harbor, and since December 7, 1941, all passenger and cargo passenger ships of our merchant marine have been requisitioned by our Government for use of the Army and Navy as troop transports, hospital ships, and so forth, and now, of course, are being released. World commerce entered a new era during the war, with air transport becoming a major enterprise and successful and profitable shipping operations are no longer a matter of surface carriers functioning independently—and of course they are not yet a matter of aircraft functioning alone. The two mediums are natural collaborators and in fact, I believe, are inseparable. I firmly believe that the maritime operator who offers an integrated sea and air service in the future will get the business and the operator who does not offer it will

eventually go out of business. It seems that all the major maritime nations, except the United States, have recognized the situation, and are making provision for it. British shipping lines are being not only permitted but encouraged by their government to supplement their existing surface facilities with aircraft. The great shipping lines of Sweden, Norway, and Holland are authorized by their governments to conduct integrated sea and air services.

Our steamship carriers are not seeking to acquire control of air transportation. They have been merely requesting from the CAB authorization to perform overseas and foreign air service in conjunction with their steamship service over and along their established steamship routes. They do not even request exclusive rights over these routes, but are willing to operate in competition with any other air service that the CAB may consider to be in the public interest.

If the steamship carriers are authorized to enter the air-transportation field, they will merely be handling the same traffic which they have handled for many years and which they have done much to build.

Maintain our merchant marine paramount is the aim and responsibility of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. We believe that the merchant marine of tomorrow will be a powerful protector of our economic safety which must be zealously guarded to assure greater economic stability to the whole world. A strong merchant marine will help keep war away from America and promote our good-neighbor policy to all nations. In this postwar world, it is clear that we will have a Navy commensurate with our national stature. Our merchant marine as an auxiliary thereto must be equally as strong and an adequate merchant marine calls for a coordinate merchant marine air-sea transportation system. This I feel certain was the policy of the Congress in 1936 when it enacted the Merchant Marine Act. Our Maritime Commission has been consistent in voicing that same opinion.

The position of our American merchant marine in this postwar period will be difficult at best. Other maritime nations, who through a combination of war losses and our accelerated building program, have been relegated to minor roles, are striving desperately to regain their former positions on the high seas. British shipowners have been urged and encouraged to pursue a policy of aggressive competition with us. In fact, while their yards are feverishly building a newer, faster fleet, we graciously permit them to continue to operate 360 United States-owned vessels in direct contravention of the intent of Congress as expressed in the Ship Sales Act of 1946. It has again and again been asserted that postwar competition in shipping will be keener and more serious than any heretofore met by American steamship companies. It is only dear Uncle Sam who has adopted a short-sighted policy of restricting the merchant marine in the utilization of aircraft in connection with steamship operations. Unless we change that short-sighted policy, and do it soon,

this vital auxiliary of our Army and Navy and important factor in our international trade will be able to offer only surface transportation in competition with the integrated and efficient sea-air service offered by foreign lines. We are indeed at the present, handing on a silver platter to foreign lines, the cream of our future overseas commerce. The interests of the American wage-earner, the American taxpayer are tied up in this problem because in an effort to place American ships on a basis of competitive equality with foreign-flag ships, Congress has provided large subsidies to equalize the cost of construction and operation. These farsighted measures will be rendered largely ineffective unless we permit our merchant marine to compete on equal grounds with those of foreign nations.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 130, Rept. No. 88), which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 76, authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SUSPENSION OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL-INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 131, Rept. No. 89), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the

bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

RESTORING THE NAME OF HOOVER DAM

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 132, Rept. No. 90), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 140, to restore the name of Hoover Dam, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by former President Herbert Hoover.

Mr. WOLCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made last Wednesday night, February 26, before the National Association of Home Builders of the United States, on the question of housing and rents.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Illinois Master Plumbers Association and the Plumbing Contractors Association of Illinois with respect to wrought steel pipe.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a bill introduced by him today.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WAR ASSETS AND OUR PROCUREMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, during the war the Navy purchased raincoats in very large quantities and used top priorities in obtaining them at a cost of something between \$8.50 to \$10.50 per coat. After the cessation of hostilities when the Navy Department took account of its stock, it was found that the supplies of these coats was very excessive and several hundred thousand were sold as surplus at a price of a little over \$3 per coat.

These coats have been kicking around the market for some time. In fact, during the last 2 or 3 weeks they have been

duce the energy, has already demonstrated its usefulness in both these fields. Radio-activation of materials in common use has pointed out possible cures for certain types of cancer and the use of tracers proved invaluable to the biologist in ascertaining the relationship of the ordinary functions of humans and plants to the biological result. Through this method can be found the answer to the usefulness of our bodily organs by tracing the flow of food from its original state to its manufacture of bodily energy.

The uses in these fields open the vistas of health and happiness to all the world if only we will be intelligent enough to restrict it to such channels.

While these benefits are not immediately before us, they can be attained through diligence and proper application.

Now, not later, but now, the average American as an individual must consider in terms of individual and collective security what bearing atomic energy will have on his life.

Does this mysterious and tremendous force mean an end to standing armies, large, well-prepared navies, an integrated air force? Certainly not. However, it does necessitate a change in our manner of thinking as regards these forces of security.

Will an army of 10,000,000 soldiers trained to march and fight by hand-to-hand or machine-to-machine combat ever again be necessary? Most certainly not. Our army of the future should be one composed of technicians in the art of atomic war on the one hand and a separate force for occupation duty on the other. New training methods must be developed by the War Department to consummate these changes. Eighteen-year-old boys recently graduated from high schools in this country are not desirable for policing the government and morals of a foreign populace.

Will our Navy as now constituted be sufficient guard against atomic aggression? Again the question precludes the answer as naval strength has never been computed on the basis of the ability to wage or resist atomic warfare. The navy of the future, and we most certainly must maintain one, should be a compact, mobile force capable of speedy retaliation and long staying power. Our Navy must be able to live for extended periods far removed from gigantic drydocks and naval bases. Such large naval yards would be primary targets for the enemy of the future. Their usefulness would not extend beyond 10 minutes of the instigation of hostilities. While it is unthinkable to consider scrapping our Navy or demobilizing its personnel, preparation must be made for concentration of effort to construct vessels and train personnel in the art of atomic warfare.

Our present air forces constitute the branch of our military services least likely to be affected by the change in the method of waging or combatting future wars. The new developments in plane structure and the use of electronic equipment has brought our air forces more nearly abreast of atomic developments. The primary functions of the air forces would remain as originally set up; to deliver to the enemy the destructive force of our weapons and repel enemy air forces attempting to retaliate. Undoubtedly, the use of rockets launched from stationary, fixed ground positions will obviate the necessity for as large air forces as have been contemplated for present methods of combat.

The military and naval services cited in preceding paragraphs are vital and necessary. Their functions are important, their place cannot be filled by other agencies. Nevertheless, these services I consider to be our second line of defense.

We in America, always pushing forward, always in the forefront in the matter of scientific development, whether for war or peace, have neglected entirely the first line of defense in warfare, whether ancient or that of the future, an adequate intelligence

system. Our British neighbors have for years maintained a system of military intelligence which has no superiors. Without it, this tight little isle with its far-flung dominions could not have weathered the storm of war and rebellion through the years. We, the greatest Nation in the world, with our linguists, geographers, cartographers, and host of citizens familiar with the peoples of the world, their habits, speech, and problems, have not progressed in our system of intelligence one iota. The Office of Strategic Services, with whom I was proud to serve during World War II, performed heroically under the handicaps confronting it. It was hastily formed and mobilized to do a job which requires years of background and study.

Under these conditions the thousands of men and women recruited from all walks of life performed nobly under the stress of war. Immediately upon cessation of hostilities this organization was demobilized and its functions assumed by the Central Intelligence Group founded by Executive order. This group, composed of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and State, with advisers from the military services, is inadequate to perform the task allotted to it. All intelligence information gathered by agents is submitted to the board for review and consideration of action. This necessitates delay in transmittal and in action taken upon such information.

What is needed is a separate, independent intelligence agency with a civilian director responsible only to the President of the United States. Such an agency could procure and disseminate information without delay and without divided authority or friction.

An independent intelligence system would be our first line of defense in the future.

Atomic warfare would not be conducted through exploratory raids and massing of troops preparatory to a declaration of war. The effects of the atom bomb would be known to the defending nation minutes after a decision to wage war was reached by the aggressor.

It is vital that we know the intent of other nations and the scope of their activities in the field of potential military aggression. It is necessary that the heads of our Government are made aware of these intentions beforehand so that proper precautions can be taken either by defensive or retaliatory measures.

Every responsible person connected with the harnessing of atomic energy is agreed that there is no defense against atomic bombs, nor is there likely to be one. The best defensive measures of the last war were 90 percent effective which, while high, would mean certain disaster in atomic warfare. Defense through decentralization of industry and population, while partially effective, would take years and completely dislocate our economy. It is not feasible to advocate such a course.

The sensible solution seems to lie in effective international control through the abolition of atomic weapons by international agreements. Even the peacetime use potential must be subordinated to this aim.

Agreements outlawing the use of atomic weapons as legitimate are not enough. There must be a system of rigid supervision through inspection to make certain that no nation is clandestinely engaged in the manufacture of these weapons while other nations in good faith are abiding by the agreement. Hand in hand with this must go a system of enforcement so that penalties may be applied to those who, with nefarious intent, are violating the covenant.

Supervision or control must take into consideration three factors—those of raw materials, personnel, and production. If sources of supply of the materials necessary to produce atom bombs are known and carefully

and continuously scrutinized, there can be no clandestine use of such material. Through registration and restriction of construction, the plants necessary to process the materials may be kept under control. No project of great magnitude could be undertaken without the collaboration of many scientists well known by their contemporaries for their accomplishments and abilities; their whereabouts and experiments must always be known. These methods of supervision would effectively prevent clandestine manufacture, if agreed upon by the nations of the world.

The tone of this address would indicate that I believe war to be imminent. That is not so. The people of America who have seen two generations of men marching off to battle within 25 years want neither expanded power nor additional territory—the main causes of past wars. I am certain that the other nations of the world, impoverished, fatigued, cold, and hungry, have neither the capacity nor the desire for war. We, the United Nations, who valiantly fought side by side to deter aggression shall certainly fight side by side to maintain peace. I fervently pray that the United Nations structure will be strengthened by the plea of all mankind to cease this horrible game of devastating one another's country and killing one another's children.

War is neither imminent nor inevitable if all the people of the world will devote their efforts toward peace in the same manner they devoted them for war. With a basic foundation in the United Nations Organization to assure peaceful settlement of disputes between nations, and adequate safeguards over atomic energy, there need never be war.

We, who have developed the atomic bomb in conjunction with Canada and Great Britain, should make certain that the secret of atomic fission shall not become international property until all nations have demonstrated their willingness to submit to inspection measures guaranteeing that no nation shall manufacture these lethal weapons.

Then, and only then, can we put aside thoughts of defense or offense for war and arouse ourselves to plan the use of this great force to insure things for better living in a better world. We need, in these troublous times, brotherhood of man seeking to better the welfare of all peoples of the world.

I personally believe that the people of the United States have definitely arrived at an unanimous decision that national security can only be guaranteed by adopting a method of control which will prevent future wars. Also such an authority or control, call it what you may, must have the inherent power bestowed upon it through a strong and comprehensive international system of control and inspection set up by a sound and workable treaty. Such a control or authority, in my estimation, should be delegated with the unquestionable power to carry out its duties and able to operate without any individual power of veto. Their responsibility is to forestall the use of atomic energy for devastating purposes and for hard and fast control to the point where atomic energy could only be used for peaceful achievements.

Again, I feel that once atomic energy has been harnessed under permanent and effective world control, it will lose its dread and fear which is so prevalent at this very moment, and become a means of prosperity and progress. According to many of our renowned scientists, atomic energy can improve the health and well-being and can act as a messenger of mercy instead of a fiery-eyed monster of devastation and destruction, worshipped by the gods of war. So, in conclusion, I advocate that atomic energy must be man's servant and not his master.

If we are to survive to participate in a wondrous future, this must be our creed.

Thank you.

**Failure To Pass H. R. 2120 Might Easily
Cost the Housewives of America in
Grocery Bills the Sum of \$200,000,000
Annually**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the debate on this bill, and the argument in favor of its passage seems to me to be overwhelming.

However, there are two points that I think could have been stressed more than they were. The first one is this: The need for this labor is very critical in certain areas in California and other Western States and in some Southern States. There can be no question of this. The result is that if this labor is not obtained to harvest the critical perishable crops of my State, the result would inevitably be a short crop.

As an indication of what could happen I might state that in 1945 the total crop of canned fruits and vegetables amounted to 55,000,000 cases. In each one of these cases there are 24 cans, or, if the cans are larger, sometimes there are a lesser number. The result of a short crop could easily be to raise the price of each can of fruit or vegetables the sum of 4 cents or roughly \$1 per case. If the crop of canned fruits or vegetables in our State should drop to 40,000,000 cases, instead of 55,000,000 cases or more which was the case in 1946, the result would be that the price could easily increase \$1 per case, which would be the equivalent of \$40,000,000 increased prices for canned goods for 1 year's crop from California alone. It appeared in the argument that sugar would be affected, and, with the tremendous volume of sugar bought by American housewives, this could add many millions more. The result of all this would be that the ones who would really lose would not be primarily the farmers and processors but the consumers of the United States, the great bulk of whom live in the great cities of this country. So the very ones who are trying to save \$10,000,000 in the handling of this problem could easily lose \$200,000,000 by increased living costs. We are trying desperately hard to hold the cost of living steady and if possible to reduce it. The only way that this can be done is by increased production. The committee has made it clear and convincing that the passage of this bill would help maintain the high level of production which we have set out to accomplish in the crop year 1947. The failure of this bill or the cutting it down and terminating it on July 1, 1947, could have exactly that result by failing to provide the necessary labor to harvest these crops.

The second point which I think could have been stressed more is this. We are now in the program. Whether we terminate it on July 1, 1947, or July 1, 1948,

our producers will bring this labor into America. If it is reduced on July 1 they will gamble that there is some way in which they can get the labor which this program provides. If they do not—and I believe they will not—if the program is terminated on July 1, the inevitable result will be that we will have a short crop. However, the cost whether carried out for 6 months or for 12 months will be approximately the same. The reason is that the bulk of the cost comes from providing transportation for the laborers from Mexico and other points outside the country places and whether we handle it for 6 months or 12 months, this cost will remain about the same. Since we have committed ourselves to this cost why not get for our \$200 or \$250 per laborer a full year's work instead of only a half year's work.

The reasons seem to me overwhelming in favor of the passage of the law and the continuation of the program until the end of the year 1947.

Resolutions of Connecticut State Grange

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions:

CONNECTICUT STATE GRANGE,
February 23, 1947.

HON. HORACE SEELY-BROWN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SEELY-BROWN: The following resolution was adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange:

"Whereas the National Grange opposes peacetime military conscription; and

"Whereas the National Grange is in favor of an adequate defense secured by voluntary means through adequate compensation and training conditions: Be it

"Resolved, That the Connecticut State Grange go on record as favoring the position of the National Grange."

Fraternally yours,

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas there is a movement on foot in the United States Congress to reduce our Federal income tax: Be it

"Resolved, That the Connecticut State Grange favor a reduction in our Federal income tax, but we feel that, because of the increase in the cost of living, the exemption for each person should be increased from \$500 to \$750."

Resolution adopted at the sixty-second session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas strikes, lock-outs, and other unnecessary shut-downs of industry injure agricultural operators and employees as well as a great many other innocent parties: Be it

"Resolved, That the Connecticut State Grange go on record as favoring such action

by our United States Congress as will tend to stop strikes and lock-outs, and make such laws as will be fair to both labor and capital and will also take into consideration the rights of the general public."

Adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

"Whereas the burden of taxes imposed upon us by the large expenditures necessary to win the war and with the national debt so large that it will take several generations to pay it off; and

"Whereas the only way to reduce taxes is to reduce Government spending: Be it

"Resolved, That the Connecticut State Grange favor reduced expenditures by our Federal Government by cutting out all unnecessary bureaus and by reducing the size of departments and turning back to the States all possible jobs taken over during the war."

The above resolution adopted at the sixty-second annual session of the Connecticut State Grange.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH L. COVELL,
Secretary.

**Address of Hon. Jesse P. Wolcott, of
Michigan, Before the National Association
of Home Builders**

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 4, 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address:

Mr. Chairman, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before the National Association of Home Builders of the United States. I wish I might have participated in all of your proceedings. I knew I would have greatly profited by attendance at the general sessions and panel discussions. In them you have discussed just about every conceivable problem that confronts the Government and the builders in the field of home and commercial construction. I am somewhat fearful that anything I might have to say tonight may be mere anticlimax, but there are certain problems of mutual interest to you as home builders and to the Congress of the United States which I would like to discuss. Even if they have been considered fully in your sessions, too much emphasis cannot be placed upon them. They are fundamental and in the solution of them we probably will find the answer to whether it is desirable to perpetuate the American way of life.

We are living in troublous times. As an aftermath of the war we find the world in social, economic, and political chaos. The doubt and uncertainty incident to our attempts to build a solid foundation for world peace and security have, I fear, caused many of our citizens to develop an inferiority complex in respect to our capabilities to effectively administer the new responsibilities which we have assumed. How senseless it is to doubt the strength of American purpose; how unsound to contend that the people of the United States are incapable of solving any problem, domestic or world-wide. Is there any doubt of our ability to understand these problems? If not, there should be no doubt



80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

AN ACT

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to
4 the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public
5 Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),
6 as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-
7 lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section
8 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued for a period not to
9 exceed six months after June 30, 1947: *Provided, That*
10 such program shall be liquidated by December 31, 1947.
11 In order to continue to make available for the purposes

1 of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor
2 camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program,
3 section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
4 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second
5 session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the fol-
6 lowing language: "or until six months after the termination
7 of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolu-
8 tion of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the
9 earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language:
10 "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier". Such
11 amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and
12 liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are here-
13 by authorized to be appropriated.

14 SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

15 (a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appro-
16 priation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Con-
17 gress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented,
18 and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit
19 or interfere with any of the functions of the United States
20 Employment Service or State public employment services
21 with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as
22 authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

23 (b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of
24 Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure
25 maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension

1 services of the land-grant colleges and the State public
2 employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of
3 domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and
4 information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the
5 proper and efficient administration of the State unemploy-
6 ment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's
7 Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

Passed the House of Representatives March 4, 1947.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS,

Clerk.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

AN ACT

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H. R. 2102 and S. 724

BILLS TO PROVIDE FOR A SIX MONTHS' EXTENSION
AND FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE FARM LABOR
SUPPLY PROGRAM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

MARCH 7, 8, AND 12, 1947

Printed for the use of of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1947

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

ARTHUR CAPPER, Kansas, *Chairman*

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, South Dakota

GEORGE A. WILSON, Iowa

MILTON R. YOUNG, North Dakota

JAMES P. KEM, Missouri

EDWARD J. THYE, Minnesota

ELMER THOMAS, Oklahoma

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana

SCOTT W. LUCAS, Illinois

TOM STEWART, Tennessee

CLYDE R. HOEY, North Carolina

CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida

JAMES M. KENDALL, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Anderson, F. A., State Director Agricultural Extension Service, Colorado A. & M. College and chairman, Farm Labor Committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, Fort Collins, Colo-----	22, 27
Bailey, Fred, the National Grange, Washington, D. C-----	75
Belyca, Ralph M., Washington State Farm Labor Committee, Seattle, Wash-----	85
Bourg, Clarence J., American Sugarcane League and Farmers Manu- facturing Beet Sugar Association, Washington, D. C-----	69
Butler, Kenneth A., Assistant Director Labor Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, United States Department of Agri- culture-----	12, 52
Davis, John H., executive secretary, National Council of Farmers Cooperatives, Washington, D. C-----	71
Gardner, Morris B., the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Asso- ciation, Hartford, Conn-----	80
Goodwin, Robert C., Director, United States Employment Service, Department of Labor, Washington, D. C-----	14, 76
Mason, Walter J., national legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C-----	108
Mitchell, H. L., president, National Farm Labor Union, American Federation of Labor, Memphis, Tenn-----	110
Overby, Edward J., Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, United States Department of Agriculture-----	3
Sasuly, Mrs. Elizabeth, Washington representative, Food, Tobacco, Agriculture, and Allied Workers of America, Washington, D. C-----	87
Tobler, Willis H., American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C-----	75
Tolbert, William H., representing the National Farm Labor Con- ference, Washington, D. C-----	73
Wilson, Meredith C., Deputy Director of Extension, United States Department of Agriculture-----	41, 57

FARM-LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1947

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:40, a. m. pursuant to call in room 324, Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur Capper (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Capper (chairman), Thomas of Oklahoma, Bushfield, Lucas, Young, Stewart, Hoey, Kem, and Thye.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We have before the committee this bill, S. 724, in which the farm groups and farm organizations are very much interested because it has passed the House in about the same form as appears in the Senate bill.

The farm organizations want to be heard, and as I understand it, they are talking in support of the measure principally.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Your first witness is Mr. Overby.

The CHAIRMAN. I believe I will call the attention of the committee to a report that we have from Mr. Dodd, Acting Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, who knows this bill pretty well, and I will read just some parts of it so that you will get the attitude of the Department of Agriculture on it. They seem to be favorable to the measure, and Mr. Dodd says:

This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 724. The bill continues the farm-labor-supply program to and including December 31, 1947, directs the liquidation of the program within 90 days thereafter and authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary for such continuance and liquidation. Section 2 of the bill provides for the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor to take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply programs have been provided to June 30, 1947, through Public Laws 45, 229, and 529.

Then he goes on to say:

Favorable action on S. 724 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm labor supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurance at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946, and the type of labor supplied under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the number of agricultural workers otherwise available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

(The letter referred to is as follows:)

MARCH 6, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: This is in reply to your request for a report on S. 724, a bill to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes. The bill continues the farm-labor-supply program to and including December 31, 1947, directs the liquidation of the program within 90 days thereafter and authorizes the appropriation of such amounts as may be necessary for such continuance and liquidation. Section 2 of the bill provides for the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor to take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply programs have been provided for to June 30, 1947, through—

Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, \$26,100,000 for 8 months of 1943; Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, \$30,000,000 for calendar year 1944; Public Law 529, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, \$20,000,000 for calendar year 1945; Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, \$25,000,000 for calendar year 1946; and Public Law 521, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, \$12,000,000 to June 30, 1947.

Favorable action on S. 724 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm-labor-supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurances at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946, and the type of labor supplied under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the number of agricultural workers otherwise available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

Extension of the authority for the farm-labor program, contained in Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented, during the calendar year 1947, with a 90-day period for liquidation thereafter, will make possible continuation of the farm-labor-supply program throughout the fall harvest season.

The provision in S. 724 for liquidation of the program within 90 days after December 31, 1947, will make possible more complete utilization of workers under the program in the late fall and early winter harvest operation—a particularly critical time, for example, in the sugar beet areas. Were it not for this provision, we would have to take most of the foreign workers out of the active-supply program starting in October in order to assure their return by December 31, 1947, in the light of the magnitude of the transportation problem. Under S. 724 the active program (as distinguished from the return of workers, the disposition of property, etc.) would terminate by December 31, 1947.

We will, of course, return foreign workers and liquidate camps and other property prior to December 31, 1947, when they are no longer needed in the program.

In order to make it clear that the authorities of Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, would apply to the extent necessary during the liquidation period, it is suggested that the following language be added, in line 10, page 1, after the words "and thereafter shall be liquidated within 90 days"; "and the provisions of said Act are hereby continued during such 90 days solely for the purposes of said liquidation."

Some of the labor supply centers, labor camps, and other facilities will be needed during the liquidation period to house foreign workers pending their repatriation. Therefore, it is recommended that the date of March 31, 1948, be inserted in place of December 31, 1947. Also, to make it clear that under

the provisions of section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Appropriation Act of 1946, as amended by S. 724, the liquidation of the labor camps is to begin when no longer needed in the operation or liquidation of the program or on March 31, whichever is the earlier, it is suggested that the proposed amendatory language (p. 2, lines 10 and 11) be changed to read: "or beginning March 31, 1948, whichever is the earlier."

For your information, it should be noted that following the termination of a program of this kind, numerous problems of final liquidation necessarily arise. After the workers have been returned, and the program otherwise terminated, some work will remain to be done in the final disposition and handling of fiscal accounts (particularly the payment of vouchers to be submitted by the National Railways of Mexico covering movements with Mexico), the repatriation of missing workers, completion of compliance records, the disposal of workers' claims for lost baggage or unpaid wages, the payment of medical bills for sick and injured workers and other items of similar nature. When the extent of this problem becomes more apparent at a later date, it may be necessary to make some provision for meeting the costs.

While we have no objection to section 2 of S. 724, and are in complete agreement with the principle of keeping to a minimum expenditures for unemployment compensation and veterans' adjustment payments, it should be pointed out that a practical plan of cooperative action in such matters has been in satisfactory operation since the autumn of 1945. This plan provides that compensation claimants with agricultural experience be referred to the extension farm-labor office for placement in agriculture, and that the extension farm-labor office report to the local employment service in regard to whether the claimants accept or refuse farm work.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD, *Acting Secretary.*

The CHAIRMAN. We have got quite a number of people from the different departments, the Department of Agriculture, and then from over the States and over the country.

First on the list is Mr. Overby, assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Senator KEM. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of information, have the hearings on the extension of the CCC been completed or have you suspended those temporarily in order to take up this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. I think we have about completed hearings on that.

Senator KEM. On the CCC?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Now, then, Mr. Overby, will you come up, please?

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, before the hearings commence, I would like to have the record show that Senator Pepper, the senior Senator from Florida, is unavoidably detained at the Labor Committee hearing which is holding a very important hearing this morning, with John L. Lewis.

The CHAIRMAN. We will make note of that. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD J. OVERBY, ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. OVERBY. My name is Edward J. Overby, sir, and I am assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been down there?

Mr. OVERBY. I have been there about 8 years.

The CHAIRMAN. Where are you from?

Mr. OVERBY. I came into the Department from Louisiana. I was born in Minnesota and came into the Department from the State of Louisiana, where I lived for a number of years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a short statement which I would like to put into the record on the history of our farm-labor program, after which I will try to furnish any information that is wanted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to know what you think of this bill.

Mr. OVERBY. We are in favor of this bill, sir; we are in favor of this bill as it extends to December 31 the farm labor program of this year.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Have you a prepared statement, Mr. Overby?

Mr. OVERBY. Very short.

In January 1943, the War Manpower Commission, by directive, transferred responsibility for farm labor placement from the United States Employment Service to the United States Department of Agriculture.

The present bill, S. 724, would extend our farm labor supply program which has been conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the several States since 1943 under authority included largely in appropriation bills. The first such bill, Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, was approved April 29, 1943. That act was succeeded by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act of 1944, which has been amended and supplemented from time to time since—the latest extension being to June 30, 1947.

Farmers confidently expected that following VJ-day the critical labor shortages they had experienced during the war years would be relieved. This has been true only in part. The supply of family workers has increased but there remains a severe shortage of agricultural workers needed for peak periods of farm operations.

Farm production has been unprecedentedly high during and following the war, and in 1947 farmers are being asked again for peak production, particularly in certain crops requiring large amounts of hand labor. The supply of machinery for harvesting purposes has not yet reached the point where the requirements for labor are materially reduced.

Before planting to meet 1947 goals, farmers have requested assurance that the farm labor supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947, will be continued through the harvest season. Such assurance will stimulate spring planting of essential crops, particularly sugar beets, producers of which are peculiarly dependent upon assistance obtained from the farm labor supply program to meet harvest needs. This bill would make possible the providing of labor during the harvest season and a needed period for liquidation of the program.

It is for these reasons that we recommend the passage of S. 724, with the minor changes in language proposed in the Secretary of Agriculture's report on the bill from which the chairman has just read.

Senator STEWART. May I ask a question at that point? You spoke of the fact that farmers are being called on for heavy production this year, and especially of certain—how did you express it?

Mr. OVERBY. Certain special sugar and oil-seed crops.

Senator YOUNG. I think it should be made clear that the Government asked for increased potato production in our northern part of the country in 1946.

Senator STEWART. What other crops have they been asked to step up production on?

Mr. OVERBY. They have been asked to raise large amounts of grain. The wheat goals are high.

Senator STEWART. Higher than they were this year?

Mr. OVERBY. No.

Senator STEWART. Last season, I mean.

Mr. OVERBY. Just about the same. We cut down the spring wheat in January of this year, though very lightly, to try to get an increase in flax.

Senator STEWART. When you ask for larger production, you say, of grains, you mean particularly wheat and corn.

Mr. OVERBY. Particularly wheat, that is, bread grains for relief feeding.

Senator STEWART. I mean, you have asked the farmers to step up production, to increase production in wheat—

Mr. OVERBY (interposing). Flax.

Senator STEWART. Flax.

Mr. OVERBY. And sugar.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Have you asked for increased production of sugar beets?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator STEWART. Sugar beets, and what else now—corn and livestock?

Mr. OVERBY. No; I would have to check those figures a little more closely first.

Senator STEWART. You haven't been asked to increase production of cotton, have you?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes; we have. We have asked for some increase in cotton.

Senator STEWART. What about potatoes that Senator Young mentioned?

Mr. OVERBY. No; we have asked for no increase of potatoes; we have tried to get it down a little.

Senator STEWART. You have got to get rid of 20,000,000 bushels of smaller ones yet.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Is there any limitation of sugar beets?

Mr. OVERBY. No.

Senator STEWART. Let me ask just one or two more questions to complete that question. I just want to develop this thought concerning this request for stepping up production of these grains, Senator. Is that consistent with the program of shipping all of this fertilizer that we are shipping overseas to Korea and Japan, possibly China and Germany, nitrate and phosphate?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, we feel that—it is a little bit out of my field, Senator—but we feel that there are some shipments of fertilizer that have been promised to these people to get their production back into what is needed. In shipments of fertilizer, probably one of the things that have to be considered is that about 1 ton of fertilizer probably takes the place of 12 or 14 tons of foodstuffs that will have to be shipped later on.

Senator STEWART. I understand the reason for that, and that it will make it unnecessary for us to furnish so much food for some of these—in some of the countries that have been devastated on account of the war; but we are getting a tremendous lot of kick-back from that. The farmers down in the Southern States, where fertilizer is a must—

Mr. OVERBY (interposing). Yes, sir.

Senator STEWART. If crops are to be maintained to any sort of a basis, they must have fertilizer. These people are making heavy demands on my office; they call us every day, write us, and so forth, and complain about the fact that they don't have any fertilizer. Other sections are more fortunate in having land that doesn't need so much fertilizer, and they are just so much more fortunate. But it looks to me to be a pretty short-sighted goal to get it just for this season. Why couldn't these farmers produce this grain and sell it to the foreign countries, affording a market in addition?

Mr. OVERBY. I think there was a very good report issued by a subcommittee of the House on this subject.

Senator STEWART. Yes, I have read it and know it by heart really but I never could agree with the idea.

Mr. OVERBY. We probably don't agree fully with everything there either, but we do have more fertilizer being used, practically twice as much as there was 5, 6 years ago, in most areas of the country. It is true that you could sell a great deal more fertilizer this year if we had the production.

Senator STEWART. Yes; there is a shortage of fertilizer.

Mr. OVERBY. But the point I am trying to make is that we have a tremendous increase in the usage, first, and we have actually less fertilizer going out of the country now under this export program than we normally export to those countries; and, of course, we import—

Senator STEWART (interposing). You mean you did normally export prior to the war.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator STEWART. Of course, during the war the manufacture of fertilizer was reduced even in our own country.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir; the demand for it was a great deal less than now. A large part of the demand was in certain areas of the Southeast, and the Midwest has just recently started using larger amounts of fertilizer.

Senator STEWART. Have you ever had a greater need for fertilizer in this country than we have this year?

Mr. OVERBY. We have never had a greater demand for it.

Senator STEWART. Well, demand usually springs—most demands do, at least, partially—from need.

Mr. OVERBY. Farm income has increased.

Senator LUCAS. That is the primary reason, the farmers' income is there; they really have the money to buy it.

Mr. OVERBY. That is the very important reason.

Senator STEWART. You said primary reason. I said there is a need for it.

Mr. OVERBY. The need for it is there, and the demand comes when the farmers can afford to buy fertilizer.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of education in that field needed, and there has been a great deal of education in that field done. Fifteen years ago the average producer would be only using it on, maybe, half a ton a season basis in the attempt to ascertain whether it was a good practice or not, and since that period of time you have gone over into a demand now where almost any 80- or 160-acre farm is using 1, 2, and 3 tons of fertilizer on their corn; so, it is a question of education; it is a question of a new operational activity on all of it combined, not only finances, but a knowledge of what is actually accomplished with a crop is what has brought about the great increase in its use.

Senator STEWART. Experience has taught the value of it.

Senator THYE. That is right. From here on out I would say you would increase it every year.

Senator YOUNG. I think there is an even greater reason for that. To meet production goals the farmers have had to crop their land intensively, whereas in former years they have laid it aside in rotation conservation practices.

Mr. OVERBY. That is right.

Senator STEWART. Now, in this demand that you have made in your request for stepped-up production, is it going to be necessary to increase acreage, the number of acres that the farmer plants? Because of lack of fertilizer—

Mr. OVERBY (interposing). There will be some slight increase in acreage. We don't think there is a great lack of fertilizer because the use of fertilizer is tremendously stepped up from just a few years ago.

Now, I agree with you fully that they would use a little more this year with these demands and with the high prices and the good farm income relative to recent years, would use more fertilizer if it was available.

Senator LUCAS. The up-to-date farmer tests his soil every year in my section of the country, and he finds out which is sour and which is good, and if it is sour, he brings in fertilizer.

Mr. OVERBY. That is right; it is a new development in practice, and I think we don't have enough this year. Some people have estimated—I think the House committee estimated—that there would be about 20 percent more fertilizer used this year if it were fully available.

Senator LUCAS. Am I correct in my understanding that S. 724 applies primarily to perishable crops?

Mr. OVERBY. No, sir. It applies to—it is available to any crop. It is used largely—that is, especially the foreign workers who are brought in under this program—are used largely by the crops that have large peak labor demands that cannot be satisfied from normal sources of labor, and that does include a lot of perishable crops like vegetables, sugar beets; especially canning crops.

Senator LUCAS. Yes; that is what I had in mind. I have in my State, a number of canning companies that are much interested in this bill.

Now, your program is for 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program. Do you think this is going to end it?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, that is hard to say. I suppose we will always have a demand for; a need, let's say, for channeling laborers from the areas they are available to the areas where they are greatly needed in peak seasons. We have considered this somewhat as a war emergency program.

Senator LUCAS. That is right.

Mr. OVERBY. And we have not asked for any extension beyond this time.

Senator LUCAS. Well, sooner or later, it seems to me, you are going to have to suspend operations of this kind altogether, otherwise you are going to have every farmer in the country coming in here and asking that his labor be given credit. I mean he would be given some credit for labor as well as these other fellows who find themselves with a bumper crop and can't handle it. If you don't apply it to all crops sooner or later instead of getting less you are going to ask for more money to take care of these crops.

Mr. OVERBY. I have some information here on the set-up of this program which I might go through and then come back to your question, if you wish.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator HOEY. How and from where does this principal supply of labor come?

Mr. OVERBY. The labor from outside the country?

Senator HOEY. Yes.

Mr. OVERBY. There are two distinct parts to this program, as I wanted to show here. The foreign labor, we get mainly from Mexico and Jamaica, and Bahamas, which are the largest sources, Mexico being the largest source, by far, of all.

Senator LUCAS. You used prisoners of war for quite a while, didn't you?

Mr. OVERBY. We did when they were available.

Senator LUCAS. Are they all shipped back?

Mr. OVERBY. They all went back last spring, Senator.

Senator HOEY. The domestic supply; where does that come from?

Mr. OVERBY. It is a program that is operated through the extension services. They gather the information on needs of labor in each territory, and they show any areas where there is a surplus of labor. The Extension Service, through their facilities, will report the surplus areas, and labor is recruited from those areas. That is the domestic phase of the program.

Senator HOEY. What part does the Government bear in relation to the expense in transporting these people, and that sort of thing?

Mr. OVERBY. On the foreign labor we have to agree with Mexico that we pay the expense of getting those people in here, and that is one of the large costs of the foreign labor.

Senator STEWART. You have to guarantee a wage scale, too, don't you?

Mr. OVERBY. We have to make minimum guaranties before they will let us recruit laborers in Mexico.

Senator HOEY. The United States would pay the expense of transporting them. Then, does the farmer pay the expense for this work?

Mr. OVERBY. He does within certain limits of the contract that is set up. We have to be able to recruit these laborers in Mexico, and we

have to make certain guaranties that they will have a certain amount of work. They will earn, I think, it is \$33 or some odd figure like that, in a 2-week period, and the farmers have to make a minimum guaranty of that amount to use their services.

Senator BUSHFIELD. How do these Mexicans get back home?

Mr. OVERBY. They are transported by the Government.

Senator BUSHFIELD. By our Government?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. How much is the cost per laborer to the Government?

Mr. OVERBY. It just depends on what we are going to put into that. If you are talking about the foreign laborers only it is rather high.

Senator KEM. Take the foreign laborers first. What is the cost per foreign laborer?

Mr. OVERBY. I will have to call on a man from our labor branch. I don't have all the details there and I was going to refer at the end, after stating our position on the bill, and tell you that there are two men in the room here who have figures.

Senator KEM. Somebody else is going to discuss the financial aspects of it?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes.

Senator KEM. Is there somebody prepared to discuss the number of persons unemployed in the country at the present time?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, there is a representative here, I believe, of the Department of Labor.

Senator KEM. He will have figures on that question.

Mr. OVERBY. I presume he will have those figures.

Senator KEM. And then, there will be figures showing the total cost of the program to the Government.

Mr. OVERBY. I have those figures right here that I would like to give you.

Senator YOUNG. I would like to bring in just one other phase of it. Your department has brought thousands of southern farm boys to the northern area each year during this emergency; they are farm boys who have a slack period during a time when we are busiest, and they come mostly from Alabama, Mississippi, Oklahoma, and largely States in that section. They have been very helpful to us.

Mr. OVERBY. That is, of course, the largest part of the program, the people that we move within the country in this program are a tremendously larger number than the foreign part of this program.

Senator KEM. In other words, to organize this thing, is there somebody prepared to discuss the question of whether the wheat farmer at the present price of wheat needs a subsidy from the Government, and so forth.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I think that we could expedite this if we permitted Mr. Overby to complete his statement. It may be that as he reads his statement we would find, or there would be in his statement an answer to some of the questions, and then I think we have two other questions as they relate to this bill, and one question would be, do we need imported labor into the United States to take care of our crops in that short period this summer, this summer coming; that is number one question.

Then, we will get down to the basis of how much is going to be the cost of the Government in carrying this program. If you have to

bring these people in, sure you are going to have to pay something, but I think if we get down to the questions of the numbers of unemployed, as Senator Kem said, you are going to get down to basically the fact that you have got to help in the United States on that only, and that you as the Department of Agriculture, must move them from here and there in the peak season load what the agricultural field will demand. So, I think if you will finish that statement it will help us to get down to what the meat of the whole thought is.

Mr. OVERBY. Thank you, Senator Thye.

It is for these reasons that I have gone through here that we recommend the passage of S. 724, with the minor changes in language proposed in the Secretary of Agriculture's report on the bill.

The farm-labor program grew out of the war necessity. With approximately 1,600,000 workers lost to the farm-labor force between September 1941, and September 1942, and with the prospect that additional hundreds of thousands of skilled agricultural workers would go into the armed services and essential war industries as the war progressed, we in the Department of Agriculture realized that a program to help supply farmers with production labor must be made available and established if food and fiber crops essential to the war were to be grown in adequate supply.

Farmers could not be expected to assume all of the other production hazards without governmental assurances that extra labor would be made available to help plant, cultivate, and harvest those crops. Throughout the deliberations which led to the establishment of food-production goals for 1943 at an even higher level than the all-time record production of 1942, the crucial factor of farm manpower assumed greater and greater importance.

The wartime farm-labor program evolved during the winter of 1942-43 reflected the best thinking of the Department of Agriculture, the War Manpower Commission, and farm organization leaders. The appropriation committees of the House and Senate also took an active part in determining the kind of a farm-labor program most likely to meet wartime needs. Based on farm production records of the past 4 years, we believe the emergency farm-labor program has been effective.

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor supply programs have been provided to June 30, 1947, as follows. I just have a listing here. For the year 1943 of \$26,000,000—that is for 8 months of that year; for 1944 calendar year, \$30,000,000; 1945 calendar year, \$20,000,000; 1946, \$25,000,000; and 1947, to June 30, \$12,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Why are these amounts falling off each year apparently?

Mr. OVERBY. This is just a half year; this last item is just one-half year. It just goes to June 30. There was an extension voted by the Congress last year to carry this up to June 30, and you notice all these others are calendar year figures.

Now, this program, by its very nature, is very difficult to work on a fiscal year basis. We have authority right now, and responsibility under the present Public Law 229, to institute a farm-labor program for 1947, and we are working on that, but the point at the moment

is that we have authority only to June 30, and unless that is going to be extended we ought to be spending the time at the moment in liquidating the program and not making plans for operation this year.

The CHAIRMAN. This bill will help out on that?

Mr. OVERBY. This bill would extend it through the calendar year, and rectify that phase of it.

Senator LUCAS. How much are you asking for to finish out this year?

Mr. OVERBY. It will be something in the neighborhood of a little less than the first half, something probably in the amount of 10 or 11 million dollars. We have not made an estimate of the exact amount yet.

Senator LUCAS. I noticed that the members of the Appropriations Committee of the House, at least some of them, fought this provision very severely.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator LUCAS. Do you contemplate when this bill goes before the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate that you are going to be able to get it out of there, in view of their attitude on economy?

Mr. OVERBY. We may have some difficulty. We expect some difficulty on this, and many other matters. But we feel it is our responsibility to bring up the point that we have at the moment, a more or less unworkable situation. We believe that the best thing to be done would be to extend it for the balance of this year, this temporary program.

Senator THYE. Mr. Overby, what did this program cost you in the year of 1945 and 1946?

Mr. OVERBY. In 1945 we had an appropriation of \$20,000,000; in 1946, \$25,000,000.

Senator THYE. Twenty-five.

Mr. OVERBY. The expenditures may have been slightly different as there is some carry-over money.

Senator THYE. Did you find it necessary to import more people in the year 1945 than you did in '46, and what was your relationship in '46 to the year of '45 in numbers of people brought in?

Mr. OVERBY. I will have to dig up some figures, Senator Thye.

Senator THYE. The reason I ask that question is that there must be a tapering off. You have got all the veterans back, and the veterans no longer are on terminal leave basis. The veteran today is a man seeking employment, and the workers that left the defense plants are likewise seeking employment, and so for that reason there is a question in my mind as to the number of people that you are going to have to import from foreign countries to meet the labor demand in this Nation.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes.

Senator THYE. What are the figures insofar as '46 relates to '45?

Mr. OVERBY. You mean just the foreign labor?

Senator THYE. Yes; the imported labor.

Mr. OVERBY. May I turn to Mr. Butler of our Labor Branch and ask if he has those figures? Mr. Butler is acting director of our Labor Branch and handles those things.

**STATEMENT OF KENNETH A. BUTLER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
LABOR BRANCH, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

Mr. BUTLER. What was that question?

Senator THYE. My question was, No. 1, could you give us information as to the number of people that you found necessary to bring in from foreign countries to meet the labor shortage in the years of '44-45, and '46. What I was trying to determine was, was there an increase or a decrease in the year of 1946.

Mr. BUTLER. There was a definite decrease in the year of 1946.

Senator THYE. How many?

Mr. BUTLER. In 1944, we imported 62,170 foreign workers.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did they come from principally?

Mr. BUTLER. Mexico was the chief source of the recruitments; the chief source of recruitment for foreign workers. Second, would be the island of Jamaica; third, the Bahamas group.

To the 62,170 foreign workers that we brought in in 1944, would be added the carry-over of workers from 1943 that worked throughout the winter and were available for work in the spring of '44, minus some repatriation. Then there were some 22,000 carried over from '43. That made a total of 84,000 workers available in 1944.

In 1945 there were 120,000 foreign workers available. In 1946, a total of 82,000.

Senator LUCAS. Do you include in those figures prisoners of war?

Mr. BUTLER. No, sir. Prisoners of war are in addition to these figures.

Senator THYE. What do you anticipate '47 will be?

Mr. BUTLER. A total of about fifty-five to sixty thousand; it is a little indefinite at this time, depending upon the needs that develop as we go along.

Senator THYE. What makes you think that you are going to have in '47 practically that which you had in that extreme war year of 1944?

Mr. BUTLER. The estimate is based on surveys that have been made by State extension directors, and people in charge of the farm-labor program on the basis of advance information that they have given us. Their original tentative request for foreign workers totaled approximately 90,000.

Senator THYE. You see that you have got two factors that you must take into consideration, and one of the factors is that you have got the returned soldiers back, and that your defense plants have tapered off, and you are back into private enterprise or industries to a certain extent, so far as the worker in the industrial field is concerned. But the other question is you are getting more new machines today, which you couldn't obtain in the war years, and which, of course, is going to relieve the situation in the agricultural field as far as help is concerned.

Now, then, what I have just said makes me wonder whether we are in complete and full knowledge of what the help situation is going to be; I mean, what it must be. It isn't what it is going to be, but what it must be insofar as the Federal Government is concerned in assisting the getting of help here in the country to do the job; when you are talking about fifty-five or sixty thousand men, when you got along with 84,174—I think that was the figure—in the year 1944—when we

were in war—and that we had all the war industries going on in every corner of our country.

Senator YOUNG. I think I can answer that in part, if I may interrupt there. We have nearly full employment now—probably the highest degree of employment we have had in years—and you don't have this migration of farm workers that you used to have, and also you will find now that there aren't so many that would go out—many laborers that would go out—and pick potatoes and hoe onions as there were before. It is just about impossible to get a young fellow to do that type of work, even milking cows.

Senator KEM. Do you have the figures on the number of unemployed persons in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER. No.

Senator THYE. Who can give us figures on the anticipated unemployment situation as of today?

Mr. BUTLER. I wonder if I may interrupt for a moment to say that to this labor force of 82,000 referred to in 1944, should be added the 102,000 prisoners of war that were available for agriculture in those years that are no longer available, and in 1945 there were 131,000 prisoners of war.

Senator THYE. 131,000 in 1945?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir.

Senator THYE. 131,000. Well, you see you are giving light on the question here that we didn't have before. We had the information of the war prisoners, because that, in reality, in '45 gave you 251,000 men rather than 120,000 men.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Senator KEM. Have you got figures on the number of American boys that have come home from the armed services?

Mr. BUTLER. I don't have those figures.

Senator LUCAS. You mean the number of farm boys?

Senator KEM. I don't know that you can break them down into farm boys, but if we had the number that were brought home there would be some light on it.

Senator YOUNG. I think there are some 16,000,000 discharged servicemen.

Mr. BUTLER. Let me make one more comment in regard to prisoners of war to complete that: There were 20,000 of those available, still available, in the spring of 1946, and they were all taken out of the country along in June.

Senator KEM. You might get that figure that the Senator from Illinois refers to by taking the percentage of persons engaged in agricultural labor in the United States, and applying it to the total number that have been brought home. That gives us a tentative figure.

Senator LUCAS. I don't think that will help me make up my mind on that bill, even if we had that figure. I don't think it is very material one way or the other. The question in my mind is of economy here. How long are we going to continue this program, whether or not we have workers in this country that are in a position to do the job?

Senator KEM. Well, wouldn't the number that have been brought home give some light on that?

Senator THYE. Who can answer the question of how many unemployed there are today; how many do you anticipate that you will have as of next summer? You have got about a 90-day season for which you are going to be confronted with help that extends across the Nation. You have got the Midwest; you have got the canning that commences in the latter part of June and early July there on the pea crop, and then you have the sweet corn that comes from there in the fall.

There are two seasons there, and that help is here practically about 45 days in the midcentral Northwest, and then you have got the extreme down South, and you have got your potato crop throughout the three areas, you might say, the South, North, and Northeast.

Senator YOUNG. I might suggest that the Employment Service—I think it is represented here—could answer many of these questions.

Senator THYE. That is what I thought somebody could come forward with and give us that information, if the Department of Agriculture has not got it, otherwise we will have to get that information.

Mr. OVERBY. Here is Mr. Robert Goodwin.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. GOODWIN, DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES
EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR**

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, my name is Robert C. Goodwin, and I am Director of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor.

Senator THYE. Can you answer that question, Mr. Goodwin, as to the number of unemployed right now?

Mr. GOODWIN. The estimate is 2,400,000.

Senator THYE. What do you expect that you are going to have next summer?

Mr. GOODWIN. We expect that it will remain about where it is now.

Senator THYE. Well now, if you have 2,000,000—

Mr. GOODWIN (interposing). Pardon, may I just finish?

Senator THYE. Surely.

Mr. GOODWIN. There will be some slight reduction, I think, as a seasonal factor; that is, your unemployment normally goes down in the summer months when some of these short-time work opportunities are available.

Senator THYE. Mr. Goodwin, we know that those are factors and that those are professional people and those are all minors; that you couldn't take these same people all out into the harvest field to assist in the crop work. We know that, but a certain percentage of those people would be young people, unskilled workers, and the type of a worker that would be accustomed to manual labor, and you would be expecting to recruit out of those 2,000,000 people a certain number that would be physically fit to go out and do manual labor. So, it would seem if you expect 2,000,000 that you should be able to get fifty or sixty thousand workers that you could recruit for the different areas under the crop seasons, as the seasons would come along. Would I be right in assuming that or would I be wrong?

Mr. GOODWIN. I think you would be wrong, Senator. Certainly in meeting the problems in certain sections of the country, I think you would be wrong. I would like, first, to point out that for the size of the labor force we have in this country and the kind of economy we

have, even 2,500,000 unemployed is not a large figure because there is a lot of that that is merely in the shifting that goes on all the time in our economy.

The type of unemployment that we have today, I think, is pretty widely misunderstood because most of us tend to think of unemployment in the way we thought of it during the depression, when it was prolonged and when extreme suffering went along with it. This is more a transitory type of unemployment—people going from one type of activity to another. It is comparatively short in duration.

Senator YOUNG. How many of those are veterans?

Mr. GOODWIN. A little less than a million. The rate on veterans' unemployment is almost three times as high as for other workers.

Senator KEM. How many of them are drawing unemployment compensation?

Mr. GOODWIN. I am sorry, Senator, I don't have those figures right off. We could furnish them for you.

Senator KEM. How many of them are still drawing compensation from the Government under the retirement provisions of the law?

Mr. GOODWIN. Well, you mean, where some disability is involved? I don't have those figures; that is administered by the Veterans' Administration.

Senator KEM. Do you know how many are still on termination leave?

Mr. GOODWIN. No; I am sorry.

The point that you raise, Senator, the difficulty comes, I would say, on distribution; many of these problems of shortage could be met if we didn't have the problem of location.

Senator KEM. Does the Department of Labor look with favor upon the importation of foreign labor into the United States at the expense of the United States Treasury?

Mr. GOODWIN. We feel that the foreign-labor program should be liquidated as rapidly as possible.

Senator KEM. Well, isn't there a way to liquidate it by liquidating it; and the way to resume is to resume?

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes; but we feel that there is evidence that there is some need for it this year, and we would—

Senator KEM (interposing). What is that evidence?

Mr. OVERBY. I will give you a little of that evidence here. There are some figures that the gentleman from Tennessee asked me about earlier on the crop goals. I would like to read a short paragraph here that the goals seek a total of 356,000,000 acres, of which 295,000,000 acres are cultivated crops; these totals exceed 1946 actual acreage by about 4 percent.

Senator KEM. Which ones of those crops at present market prices do you feel are in need of a subsidy from the United States Treasury?

Mr. OVERBY. I will list the crops here, if I may, that we have asked for increases in. The greatest expansion called for in '47 is in cotton, flaxseed, dry beans, soybeans, barley, grain, sorghums, and sugar crops.

Senator KEM. Which of the producers do you feel are in need of a subsidy at the present time?

MR. OVERBY. Probably none of them on the basis of present prices only. However, we do feel that they need some help in making labor available.

Senator KEM. Why didn't you come back with that kind of a bill instead of one that will cost the Treasury 10 or 12 million dollars for a 6-month period?

Senator YOUNG. Senator Kem, I don't think farmers want a subsidy.

Senator KEM. I don't think they do either.

Senator YOUNG. I don't think this help should be classed as a subsidy.

Senator KEM. They want the finances of the Government to be put on a sound basis.

Senator YOUNG. This should not be classed as a subsidy. The farmers are paying as high as \$18 a day for potato pickers. Of course, they do not earn that all the time, but they do earn very high wages.

Senator KEM. But the figures indicate that they ought to raise something else this year, Senator.

Senator YOUNG. Well, the same thing applies to beets and wheat that you want to produce.

Senator KEM. It doesn't seem to me that the testimony that we have had about the potato crop is such that we should stimulate and re-energize the production of potatoes right now with them rotting on the ground.

Senator YOUNG. That was a goal last year; they asked them to meet certain goals.

Senator KEM. Shouldn't we change our goals as we go along?

Senator YOUNG. You might eventually find the same "overproduction" in sugar beets and flax and other crops. You might find these crops, too, going to waste on the ground. The problem is not confined to potatoes alone. Even as it was last year's potato crop resulted despite a substantial cut in acreage. The potato acreage goal for 1947 is still lower. So we are adjusting as we go along.

Senator KEM. Shouldn't we look at the picture as it is today and not be governed by, too much by, the situation as it was in the past?

MR. OVERBY. We have made great changes in these goal figures.

Senator KEM. We have needed assistance for agriculture in the past, and perhaps we will need it in the future. Should we not be asking for it when we need it, and when we do not need it, should we not say that we do not need it?

Senator YOUNG. I would say this: That this program should be on its way out, and I think it is on its way out. It was largely set up to take care of a situation where farm boys were drafted. But it should not be killed altogether until the emergency that creates the need for it has passed.

Senator KEM. Now, it is over and the boys are back.

Senator YOUNG. I don't think you have entirely gotten away from the need. The Agriculture Department does offer a service that no one else does; these employees are handled through your county agents, which is a cheaper way in an emergency than is even your placement bureaus. As for the need now, I don't know.

Senator LUCAS. Do you think the sugar crop could have been handled last year without the importation of this Mexican labor?

MR. OVERBY. If you had cut it off at this time last year I don't think you would have handled it. I think you would have lost a tremendous

amount of sugar beets in the West if we had not had Mexicans to move in where they were needed.

Senator LUCAS. It is pretty hard labor, isn't it?

Mr. OVERBY. It is not labor desired by most of the people seeking employment in this country.

Senator THYE. I would want to get this into the record, Mr. Chairman, that prior to this type of a farm program it was absolutely customary to, on the part of the producer of sugar beets in all areas, contract his sugar-beet acreage from the standpoint of first thinning out, then the weeding, and then the general supervision of the job of keeping that field clean until harvest time; and then he proceeded to assist in the general harvesting; that is the shaking them out and the topping of them and the loading of them.

Now, that was on a contract basis. You could go out through the West wherever sugar beets are grown and you would find that that type of arrangement was carried on.

During the war years the producer was absolutely unable to cope with that situation because there was a market that demanded the labor on every corner and the producer individually found himself unable to meet the situation, and then the Department of Agriculture entered the field and commenced to recruit the labor here and there, concentrated them, and kept them in camps, and the producer paid for the labor whenever he used them, whether he was in the sugar-beet field or the canneries or wherever he might be working. It was a splendid program.

Senator KEM. As a war measure.

Senator THYE. If we then can taper it off so that we don't leave the cannery of both peas and sweet corn and the sugar beet area and the other areas that need that peak load of help, if we can taper it off, that is the thought that I have on the question.

Now, when the question of tapering off comes, if it comes, and I think that you gentlemen have got a complete understanding from the producer groups as to just what they expect they will need, and you have got it here figured out so that this is the last year that you expect to be in that field—one reason why you are here today is that the industrial world is demanding the worker; the commitment of this Government to the foreign countries, in the foreign countries' needs are tremendous, and that all in all, in order to save and safeguard our falling off of food production, you feel that you are going to have to enter certain areas and furnish the necessary help to salvage that crop, whether it be peas or sweet corn or sugar beets or potatoes later in the season—

Senator LUCAS (interposing). Mr. Chairman, I am greatly intrigued with this speech of the Senator from Minnesota, but I thought we came in here with questions, to get answers from the Department of Agriculture.

Now, I hope that the chairman will permit questions and answers. I recall when Senator Smith was chairman of this committee, we did the same thing we are doing now; we just talked among ourselves in here and argued among ourselves and never got anywhere. I finally quit coming to Agriculture Committee meetings as a result of it.

I would like to get the statement from the witness, and then ask him questions on it. We make these arguments on the floor of the

Senate later on. This isn't a criticism. I have enjoyed what the Senator has said; it is constructive. But it doesn't seem to me that we ought to argue back and forth and state our views here. I do believe that when we call these witnesses in here they are the fellows who ought to state their views. I want to know what they know about this situation, and later on we can debate it in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. How about it, Mr. Witness?

Mr. OVERBY. I have just a couple of more paragraphs here to complete this statement.

There is very little the Senator from Minnesota said that we don't agree with fully.

Senator THYE. Thank you. Then you will admit there was something constructive about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator LUCAS. I admitted it. I admit there was something constructive about it. I want to hear somebody else. I hear you Senators all the time. [Laughter.]

• Mr. OVERBY. But there are two more or less distinct parts of the labor program carried on under the Farm Labor Supply Act. (1) An intrastate program conducted by the State agricultural extension service with the county agent supervising the program in each county, and (2) a program of importing nationals of other Western Hemisphere countries to supplement the domestic labor supply wherever necessary. The latter program is the responsibility of our Labor Branch. The Labor Branch also operates all of the federally owned or leased farm-labor camps, many of which were established by the Farm Security Administration prior to World War II.

The domestic program is supervised by the Federal Extension Service.

Mr. Wilson, Deputy Director of Extension Service, is here; as is also Kenneth Butler, from whom you have heard, Assistant Director of the Labor Branch.

Colonel Buie, Director of the Labor Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, is in Mexico City negotiating for Mexican nationals for 1947. These gentlemen are familiar with the details of program organization and operation, and what the probable situation on farm labor supply is likely to be in all parts of the country during the months ahead.

I, myself, am not familiar with all administrative and operational details of the program, but if specific information is desired on either phase of our program, both of these gentlemen are available at the committee's pleasure.

Senator KEM. I would like to ask a question. I don't know whether it will be answered by you or the gentleman from the Labor Department. Lawyers here will recall the case of the United States against the wardens and vestrymen of Trinity Church in which that church was prosecuted for bringing a rector into the United States on contract. I mention that as illustrating that it is always and it has always been the theory of our laws that peacetimes, foreign labor be not imported into the United States under contract; that we employ our citizens to do such work as we have to do.

Now, is the Department of Labor recommending a reversal or a change in that policy?

Mr. GOODWIN. No; in answer to the question, we are not. My understanding of the legislation now is that an exception is made for this particular project.

Senator KEM. Why? The war has been over for 2 years. Of course, there was a war measure, and we all supported that war measure and favored it then. It is my question: Is it sound now when the war has been over for 2 years to continue to import labor into this country under contract, and particularly at the expense of the United States Treasury?

Mr. GOODWIN. I think that is more in your line in answering that, Mr. Overby.

Mr. OVERBY. As to the first part of your question, Public Law 229, under which we now operate, does suspend certain provisions of the immigration law.

Senator KEM. And that was a war measure?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. And justified as a war measure, and passed as a war measure.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. Now, the war has been over 2 years, hostilities ceased—

Mr. OVERBY. And yet we are asking for increased production of agricultural commodities because of the world situation in food, and we are still not able to get all of the labor that is needed to produce these crops. I admit that there are lots of people back here from the Army.

Senator KEM. That brings up another question, or part of that question. Assuming that we have to bring them in? Should they be brought in at the expense of the United States Treasury?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, sir, I don't believe that any sugar-beet producer, any citrus producer, any canning crop producer could afford to bring his own people up from Mexico as individuals. Now, there might be some other arrangement if they could get them, but the Mexican Government has been rather difficult also. They would contract for supplying labor only with the Government of this country and to the Government of this country.

Senator KEM. Are you talking about the producers of the crop or the canners of the crop?

Mr. OVERBY. I am talking about the producers.

Senator KEM. Producers?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. Which crops are those?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, I mentioned canning crops, peas and corn, sweet corn and sugar beets.

Senator KEM. Now, have you got prices here on those articles, those commodities?

Mr. OVERBY. No, sir; I don't have them.

Senator KEM. Are they depressed, in a condition of depressed prices calling for assistance from the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. OVERBY. I don't think so, but, of course, that is a matter that there is lots of difference of opinion about. I mean at any given price, there is a difference of opinion.

Senator KEM. Should you not have figures on that here for us if we are going to pass on this bill for you?

Mr. OVERBY. What I am trying to say is that if I had figures for you, I don't believe I could say whether that was a depressed price or not, and that it was a matter of judgment.

Senator KEM. Well, you could tell us whether that was a price lower than had been customary.

Mr. OVERBY. I don't think we have any situations that are like that. I think they are all relatively high prices on any comparisons which are made in the past, except citrus.

Senator KEM. Why, under those circumstances, should we even consider a subsidy from the Treasury for these producers?

Senator LUCAS. That is a matter for the Congress to decide, isn't it?

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. I am asking him what the reason is for us to decide that.

Senator THYE. I am reluctant to raise one other question here, but it is as much of a question of subsidizing the farmer in the help as it is the administrative cost in concentrating the help here and there, wherever it is needed in season. I wonder if we confuse our thinking on this question to this extent, that we think that the farmer, the producer, is being paid by the Government for the help here or whether the Government is entering in here to pay an expenditure for the supervision of this help in its attempt to concentrate it where it is needed. That is the question I wish somebody would answer specifically, whether Mr. Overby does or somebody else.

Mr. OVERBY. There is no question about it. Basically, it is a help to the producer who uses this labor that is brought into the country; I will not argue that point at all.

Senator KEM. What are the items that this \$12,000,000 goes into?

Mr. OVERBY. What do they go into? It is broken up between States in the work that is done by the Extension Service.

Senator KEM. That is overhead.

Mr. OVERBY. No, sir; that is the work that is done in moving all the domestic workers.

Senator KEM. You mean transportation charges.

Mr. OVERBY. No; it is the recruiting and the work of telling, finding out which areas have excess labor and which have need of labor.

Senator KEM. That is statistical work.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes, to a large extent by the county agents which they do out in the counties.

Senator KEM. About what does that cost?

Mr. OVERBY. Out of the 12,000,000, that costs about \$4,000,000; just under \$4,000,000.

Senator KEM. For statistical work.

Mr. OVERBY. Well, that is for the work that is done, the recruiting and the finding of the workers. All the county agents in every county do the work in getting the information together, so that if you say in a certain part of your State laborers are needed the first or second week of October, there is some——

Senator KEM (interposing). You don't pay the county agents for that, do you?

Mr. OVERBY. Well, we have to allocate money to them if they are doing that or going to do that work. We do; yes, sir.

Senator KEM. You pay them a special compensation for that?

Mr. OVERBY. I mean if you are a county agent down here getting a salary, you do not get an increase in salary because you have this work, but if you have enough of this work, you may have to have an assistant for the work to be done.

Senator KEM. I mean you take any part of this appropriation and apply it to that expense.

Mr. OVERBY. Yes; we have to; we break it up between the domestic part of the program and the other.

Senator KEM. I am talking about the county agents.

Mr. OVERBY. We take out of this \$3,900,000, \$3,710,000 is allocated to the States to the extension service in the States who spread it out to the counties for the work that is done; part of it is at the State level, too.

Senator KEM. How much of it goes for transportation of these laborers?

Mr. OVERBY. Of foreign laborers?

Senator KEM. Yes; foreign laborers.

Mr. OVERBY. We have a figure here of about 3¾ million. That is for transportation and subsistence en route.

Senator KEM. That is subsistence, too?

Mr. OVERBY. Transportation and subsistence en route.

Senator KEM. How much does it cost to recruit the laborers and put them under contract abroad?

Mr. BUTLER. We don't have that broken down but that cost is included in this figure, and it is relatively small because of our cooperative arrangements with the country in which we recruit.

Senator KEM. Now, does the Government pay the laborers anything directly—any part of their salary or wages?

Mr. OVERBY. We do in certain instances when—Ken, do you want to take that?

Mr. BUTLER. Under the agreement with the Mexican Government, the workers are assured income every 2 weeks for \$33.60. That is included in the employment agreement; and the user of the worker has to assume that responsibility. Should there appear a time during the year when the worker is not employed or if the farmer who is employing him fails to meet those guaranties, then the United States Government would have to make the payment directly to the worker.

Senator KEM. What does that cost?

Mr. BUTLER. Well, that—out of this \$12,000,000 you speak of we had estimated that our guaranties to the workers under the contract would cost \$150,000.

Senator KEM. Now, are there any other items of expense with this Mexican labor?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; we have, of course, the cost of the medical care to the workers, to the foreign workers, that are brought into the country. That would run about \$950,000; and then we have our center operations, our camps, that we operated, 161 of those in 25 States in 1946, and we estimate that that will cost a million and a half out of the \$12,000,000 referred to.

Senator YOUNG. I would like to ask Mr. Goodwin a question. If this program is continued only to January 1, how do you expect to

handle this farm placement problem after that? How do you think it should be handled?

Mr. GOODWIN. Well, the farm placement function was originally provided for by the Congress in the Wagner-Peyser Act which was passed in 1933, and this program that you are talking about now is a temporary war program. We had assumed that when the emergency was over that that function would come back to the United States Employment Service, and that it would be handled as a part of the regular function of the United States Employment Service. We have, as you probably know, about 1,800 employment offices located all over the country. Those are State employment offices now that are affiliated with the United States Employment Service; and in addition to that, some 2,600 itinerant offices are maintained. We would handle the program, should it come back to us, through that system.

About 83 percent of our total offices are located either in agricultural communities or adjacent to them, and it would be a very easy thing to tie in to the system we have for other employment now.

Senator YOUNG. Does your Department feel that without this appropriation you could meet the minimum requirements of sugar beets, canning factories, and so forth, in the need for food?

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to interrupt the witness here just for a minute. We have got one witness here who has not yet been heard, and who has got to leave tonight. He is Mr. Anderson, director of extension, representing the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities.

Mr. GOODWIN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Anderson present?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir. I leave this evening; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If these other gentlemen will excuse us, we will finish with your statement later, Mr. Overby.

Mr. OVERBY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have to accommodate Mr. Anderson on this because he must leave tonight. Go right ahead, Mr. Anderson.

STATEMENT OF F. A. ANDERSON, STATE DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE OF COLORADO A. AND M. COLLEGE, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FARM LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, FORT COLLINS, COLO.

Mr. ANDERSON. My name is F. A. Anderson, and I am State director of agricultural extension service of Colorado A. and M. College, and chairman of the farm labor committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities.

The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead.

Mr. ANDERSON. Included among the functions assigned to State extension services under Public Law 229, the emergency farm labor program, is the determination of the need of farm workers of all classes, and the certification of foreign—the need for foreign workers, if they are available, to the labor branch of the Production and Marketing Administration. Then, we have the responsibility for the recruitment of all the local workers that are possible within the States

and cooperative agreements, the working out of arrangements whereby interstate workers may be moved from a State of supply to a State of need for seasonal work insofar as they are available in that way, and then we have the responsibility, of course, for the placement of all workers that are supplied from all sources, including the foreign labor element.

We have, as a part of our set-up, what is called an Association of County Agricultural Agents that meets annually in Chicago in December.

I went to Chicago for that meeting expressly for the purpose of soliciting their judgment and interpretation regarding the farm labor supply in 1947; that was in December of 1946.

The consensus there was that the local labor supply throughout the United States in 1947 would not be very much different from that which we experienced in 1946. We did have a serious deficiency in our labor supply in 1946, as we had during the war years.

On the basis of the information obtained from that group of county agricultural agents in Chicago, our committee made a recommendation to the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities to the effect that a request be made for an extension of the emergency farm labor program from June 30, 1947, as now authorized, to December 31, 1947, for the reason that it was not practical to have a program and people available for a limited time and not to have the same people available when even more needed later in the season for the harvest.

The executive committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges concurred in that recommendation and are on record as having expressed the belief that there will be a serious deficiency in our farm labor supply in 1947, and that without an extension of the emergency farm labor program for the calendar year 1947, there will necessarily be a substantial curtailment in some very important crops that are needed both for domestic consumption and for export.

Senator LUCAS. Let me ask you, Doctor, in the meeting you had with county agents, was there any discussion with respect to the 1948 crop and the possible deficiency of labor for the handling of these crops at that time?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we didn't talk about 1948; we do recognize that there has been a diminishing need for imported labor as was brought out here today.

Senator LUCAS. Let me ask you this further question right along that line. Do you believe that if the Congress continued this act until December 31, 1947, that would be the end of it or will the county agents meet next year again or this fall and decide that this shortage is such that they are going to come in and ask the Congress to extend this again?

Mr. ANDERSON. The information supplied to me by county agents was on the basis of information supplied to them by farmers in their respective counties throughout the United States. The county agents nor the Extension Service nor the Department of Agriculture are not promoting this program from the standpoint of promotion.

Senator LUCAS. I am glad to get that statement from you.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are merely attempting to ascertain from the farmers of the United States their needs for farm labor.

Now, we do know that there was a loss of a very large portion of our normal farm-labor supply locally prior to and during the war. We know that there has not been a return to the farms of any appreciable number of farm people, farm workers, as such, that left prior to and during the war; and it is because of that that we are confronted with this serious deficiency in our labor supply; and we have certain crops that do require a great deal of hand labor, labor of a character that the general run of farm workers will not do.

Senator LUCAS. Now, that brings up a point right there, the general run of farm laborers will not handle it. For instance, the caring for sugar beets and the caring for the crops that go into canning, and so forth, what ultimately is the answer when you eliminate the foreign labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Prior to our approach to the war, we did have an adequate supply of domestic labor within the United States that was willing to do what we referred to as "stoop" labor for the purpose of growing sugar beets and canning crops and vegetables and other work that requires that class of labor. But a large portion of that labor supply disappeared prior to and during the war, and has not been restored to the farms of the United States, and farmers for that reason are confronted with the necessity of asking Congress to provide ways and means whereby a limited number of foreign workers may be brought in, in order that they might plant and harvest the crops that are needed, and that cannot be produced unless that class of labor is supplied.

Senator LUCAS. Do you think if we discontinue it now as of December 31, that you are going to get the folks here in America to do that "stoop" labor next year?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Senator LUCAS. Then you are going to have the same thing again.

Mr. ANDERSON. We are in the process of developing mechanization; a great deal has been accomplished, not much; machinery couldn't be produced during the war; it isn't being produced to any appreciable extent at the present time. Really, our first successful experience in the mechanization of the sugar-beet industry was in 1946. We had a limited number of machines that were practical, and were used in planting seed, sugar-beet seed, and even in harvesting, but the equipment is not yet available.

Now, we, who are in the sugar-beet area, feel that we must continue to do everything that is possible to increase the mechanization of the sugar-beet industry, and thereby reduce the hand labor that is required proportionately. But we are not in a position to get the equipment and to be relieved of the need for that hand labor in 1947.

Senator LUCAS. Let me ask you this question. How do the wages for the ordinary labor that wheat farmers compare with the wages for labor for sugar-beet farmers? Is it a question of wages that causes these men not to go into the sugar-beet labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it is the character of the work that is involved; it is hard work and work of a character that has never been done except by Spanish-Americans in our own country, mostly from Texas, New Mexico, and when the supply became exhausted there, the only

recourse was to go to Mexico and other foreign countries that could supply a class of labor that was willing to do the kind of work that must be done in order to grow sugar beets.

Senator LUCAS. Assuming there will be a sugar shortage for next year throughout the world, and that we shall still be, which I hope we are not, rationing sugar, and in your opinion, if you produce the kind of a sugar crop that is necessary for 1948 and those conditions still exist, would it be necessary to import foreign labor in order to get that crop out?

Mr. ANDERSON. You are talking about '48?

Senator LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not prepared to make any statement.

Senator LUCAS. I am assuming that conditions are the same in '48 that they are now, as far as employment and unemployment is concerned, and as far as the world demand for sugar is concerned.

Mr. ANDERSON. We do know that we had 150,000 fewer contracting workers, and by that I mean prisoners-of-war and foreign workers, in 1946 than we did in 1945. We think that the number that will be needed in '47 will be fewer than were needed in '46.

In other words, there has been a diminishing need over a period of several years for foreign labor. But the need still exists for a rather large supply of foreign labor in 1947. Now, no one can determine what the situation will be after 1947.

Senator LUCAS. It is a little difficult for me to understand how you ever raised a sugar crop out there.

Mr. ANDERSON. We didn't produce the acreage that should have been produced, and the acreage produced in sugar beets did not approach the goal that was set by the Department of Agriculture; the goal is even greater for 1947 than it was in 1946. It takes an average of one man for every 10 acres of sugar beets to do the field work that is required in the production of sugar beets.

Now, every State—I mentioned having met with the county agents in December; since that time every State has made a careful survey of its labor supply and needs for the purpose of anticipating that which must be done in 1947. I can illustrate what has been done over the country by citing some figures that apply to the State of Colorado, and this compilation was made recently at the meeting that was attended by sugar-beet processors, farmers, and others who are concerned in sugar-beet production.

Senator KEM. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for the witness to return at another session? I would like to ask him some questions. Of course we have to go now; the Senate is in session.

The CHAIRMAN. How about that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, our legislature is in session; we have a legislative session at home; we have hearings scheduled for next week, and my plan was to leave this evening and get back to Denver before that. Can you tell me when there might be an opportunity? Would it be during the course of the day?

The CHAIRMAN. How about tomorrow morning?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, this is so important I would try to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be a great favor to us if you could be here tomorrow morning.

Senator KEM. We would like to hear your views, particularly on the subsidy feature of this bill; at least, I would like to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I will make it. If I can appear again in the morning, I will arrange accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, we will adjourn until 10:30 tomorrow morning. Thank you for coming.

(Whereupon, at 12 noon, the committee took an adjournment until 10:30 a. m., Saturday morning, March 8, 1947.)

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

SATURDAY, MARCH 8, 1947

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:40 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 324, Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur Capper (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Capper (chairman), Thomas of Oklahoma, Bushfield, Aiken, Ellender, Pepper, Young, Hoey, Kem, and Thye.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Yesterday we were listening to Mr. Anderson, director of extension, Fort Collins, Colo.; chairman, farm labor committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities; and I don't believe he had concluded his testimony. We should like to hear Mr. Anderson.

STATEMENT OF F. A. ANDERSON, STATE DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE OF COLORADO AGRICULTURAL AND MECHANICAL COLLEGE, AND CHAIRMAN OF THE FARM LABOR COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, FORT COLLINS, COLO.—Resumed

Mr. F. A. ANDERSON. Thank you, Senator.

I think that when the testimony terminated yesterday, we were talking about the information that has been compiled in all of the States including the need for imported labor, and I can illustrate that, I think, to best advantage, by citing the situation in the State of Colorado using sugar beets as the basis for it, because that is the crop that requires most of the kind of labor that we are talking about.

This information was compiled by county agents, by representatives of the sugar-beet companies through their field men and others, and I feel is a very conservative and an accurate statement of the needs for foreign labor and domestic labor for the sugar-beet crop in particular for 1947.

Farmers have indicated intentions out there to plant 209,000 acres of sugar beets in 1947; that is contingent upon the labor being forthcoming and assured, assured in advance of planting.

Now, all of the crops for which this kind of labor is required involve a lot of expense in growing, and farmers will not plant the acreage that should be planted, and that has been requested by the Department of Agriculture unless they have assurances in advance of planting that the labor will be forthcoming, and we are rapidly approaching—

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, Dr. Anderson, I didn't hear your testimony yesterday, but I would like to ask you a question at that point, if I may. Do you feel that it is justified for the Federal Treasury to pay for the handling of this labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do, for this reason, Senator. The word "subsidy" was used yesterday. I don't believe that the word "subsidy" has proper application to this particular program. Foreign labor is premium labor; it is expensive to the Government, and it is expensive to the growers. Every grower who has used and who uses contracted labor, that is foreign labor, as an example, in all of the States in which it is used, is a member of what we call a farm-labor association.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But the labor that you use in Colorado, the domestic labor, the people pay for that themselves, not the Federal Treasury.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, that is what I am trying to bring out. Every employer of foreign labor is a member of a farm-labor association, so-called; that is, it is a group of farmers organized for the purpose of doing that which must be done in financing this kind of a program.

Senator HOEX. How does the fee correspond that the farmer pays to the domestic laborer to that of the foreign workers?

Mr. ANDERSON. The present program provides that the fee is to be the same as that paid to the free workers, that is, to our domestic workers, and the State extension services, under Public Law 229, are required to conduct hearings attended by employers and workers for the purpose of determining the prevailing wages, and that determination is transmitted by the director of extension to the Federal Extension office, and becomes the wage that must be paid to foreign workers, with the exception of sugar beets, and the sugar-beet wages are determined by the Department of Agriculture at hearings conducted by the Department in various sections of the country. Those hearings have not yet been held for 1947.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I understand that, Doctor, but the point that sticks in my mind is your employers, just as they do in South Dakota, pay their own expenses.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You are asking the Federal Government to pay the expenses of these foreign laborers.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is extra expense involved in the importation of foreign laborers, both to the Government and to the growers. The Government is asked to provide funds with which to pay the transportation and certain other expenses incident to the utilization of foreign labor. The employers are required to meet certain conditions that are specified in the negotiations that are concluded with that foreign government, and among those requirements is one to the effect that in the event that the foreign workers are unable to work due to unfavorable weather conditions and otherwise, the growers must assume certain expense for the purpose of sustenance, and to illustrate the seriousness of that, and the added expense that farmers, as employers of that type of labor must incur, I know it to be a fact that one single association in our State was compelled to borrow \$40,000 from a local bank in the fall of 1946 to pay the added expense incurred by growers in providing subsistence to a large number of foreign workers who were there unable to work because of unfavorable weather conditions.

Senator YOUNG. Dr. Anderson, is it not true that ceilings are placed on sugar because, in all probability, if there were no ceilings, with sugar selling at those prices, sugar would be selling at 30 or 40 cents a pound, and sugar-beet producers would get rich producing sugar beets, and they would pay rates that were attractive to get workers for their crop of sugar beets. I don't think it is a subsidy at all. As a farmer myself, I nearly see red when someone mentions subsidy.

Senator AIKEN. In this connection, I would like to add that last year the Federal Government paid American industry over \$1,000,000,000 in subsidies. I can furnish the list complete of every dollar of those subsidies; it amounted to over \$1,000,000,000 that was paid to American industry; and because of this subsidy, industry could compete for domestic labor against all agriculture.

Furthermore, after the middle of the summer, the production of industry was not covered by ceilings; that is not much of it; the sugar industry was still covered by ceilings. Therefore, if any subsidy is warranted at all, and that is open to question, it would certainly be warranted to the sugar growers, the producers of this country, in the form of price or assistance in getting labor or other assistance. They certainly are caught between a ceiling on one side, and industry outbidding them for labor on the other side.

Senator YOUNG. And several billion dollars were spent in consumer subsidies all during the war.

Senator AIKEN. People do not realize the extent to which American industry is subsidized, and thereby is able to outbid practically every farmer in the United States to get labor away from them.

Senator THOMAS. What States make use of their foreign labor? Give the order of importance, and by "importance" I mean the numbers that they use.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know that I can answer that specifically, Senator. California uses more than any other State; Colorado uses a large number; Montana uses a large number; Utah uses some; the northern Central States, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio.

Senator YOUNG. North Dakota, Montana.

Mr. ANDERSON. North Dakota, Montana. I do not know whether I mentioned Wyoming or not; Arizona, and the Southern States have not been using—yes, they have; the Southern States have used a good deal of foreign labor for cotton picking; Texas is the only State out in our section of the country that does not use it because of a peculiar situation that exists there.

Senator BUSHFIELD. May I ask you this question, Doctor? Do not the orchards in the West have a lot of outside labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; they require a great deal of outside labor.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Well, does the Government pay for that labor? I mean bringing them in.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Government does not pay for this labor. The farmers must pay the workers the prevailing rates that are paid to local farm workers. I think it is unfortunate that the word "subsidy" is associated with this program for the reason that it is not that at all, in my opinion.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I agree with you in that.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is a service that only the Federal Government can render to farmers that are in need of farm labor in deficiency areas

in order that enough workers may be available to produce the crops that are required.

Now, when I say that only the Government can render that service is that—it is for the reason that there must be congressional authority and legislation authorizing negotiations between our Government and the foreign government for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does the bulk of that outside labor come from?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, out in our country we depend to a very large extent upon Latin Americans from Texas to do this type of work, and if I may submit a few figures to give you that particular information, I think it would answer your question, sir.

Senator YOUNG. First, Dr. Anderson, may I ask this question. Is it not true that about half of those on the unemployment rolls, veterans, are the type of people that could not be expected to go out and top sugar beets, for instance? I don't believe there are half a dozen men in this room that could earn their salt topping sugar beets, myself included.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think possibly more than one-half of the unemployed today are veterans; I do not have access to the statistical information.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Are those citizens of Texas whom you mentioned a moment ago, is their transportation paid by the Government?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; they are paid by the employers.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That is what I thought.

Mr. ANDERSON. They operate recruiting offices in Texas and the employers, even during these war years and during this emergency, have spent more money, I know, and put forth more effort bringing free labor into these deficiency areas than they did before the war; but the required number of workers to do the total job within the United States are just not available.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I see.

Mr. ANDERSON. And for that reason it becomes necessary to supplement our domestic labor supply for whatever period is necessary with foreign labor in order to produce the particular acreage that is required and desired, and that could not be produced without this supplemental labor supply.

Senator THOMAS. We have in Oklahoma a great wheat section, and our wheat matures earlier than it does in Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, and many of our citizens, when they get through with their local harvest, they start north with their combines and trucks and labor, and they cut wheat until wheat is all cut clear up to Canada.

Now, my question is, Are these Oklahomans who do this class of work, are they classified as foreigners when they reach Kansas and Nebraska? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON. No; we have three classes of workers. We have the intrastate, who are people in the State; and we have the interstate, who are people in other States, and they have been an important part of this emergency farm-labor program.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Your employers, Senator Thomas, pay their own expenses for those people coming up from Texas, do they not?

Senator THOMAS. I think they charge so much a bushel or so much an acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. An important phase of this emergency farm program, farm-labor program, has been for a State in which there is a deficiency in their labor supply to negotiate with another State in which there are workers available at certain seasons, not needed in the State of supply, and by a cooperative arrangement among the States workers are moved at the expense of employers.

Senator YOUNG. These combines, Senator Thomas mentioned, have been arranged for by the Department of Agriculture, and I would like to state here, Senator Thomas, that if it weren't for your combines many thousands of acres of our wheat would not have been harvested at all; they do a good job, and they know their business.

Senator THYE. Well, Mr. Chairman, that question does not relate to the question that we have before us here, because due to the lack of machinery and the ability to purchase new machinery, the combine would leave North Dakota and Canada and travel south, and commence down in the Panhandle district of Texas to harvest, which comes in June, and then they would roll north and harvest all the way and finish in the North.

Senator YOUNG. Senator, this program is arranged for by the Department of Agriculture.

Senator BUSHFIELD. It is not paid for, Senator Young.

Senator YOUNG. But the cost is there, too.

Senator THYE. It is not related to this question here, you see.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that it is part of the program, Senator.

Senator THYE. It is a part in the sense that you speak of, but the greatest problem that you have to face in this program that we are asking questions about here this morning, and that is with regard to hand workers and that type of field worker that we, as Americans, have so rapidly gotten away from, and only in dire need do we turn back to hand labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator THYE. And we have turned away from that type of a job to make a living. So, when we say that there is a need to continue this program, personally I would say that if you cut this program off today you would leave the canning industries in the areas that supply the canning crop in a chaotic condition because you still have a very high employment in the industrial areas that take all the available workers and then you have not sufficient men out in the rural areas to meet that demand, and if you cannot meet it, your canning crops, like the peas in June and your sweet corn, and then your beets in the fall or your citrus crops, would absolutely be a question of whether you could salvage it or whether it would be ruined.

Now, that is the question, and my whole concern in asking questions yesterday was to try to ascertain whether you were building the program or whether you were curtailing it as the conditions were changing, and I think you are curtailing it, and I would support the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. Very good.

Senator THYE. That is the whole statement that I have got to make to the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think I can clarify some of these questions by citing a few figures, if I may. I did make the statement yesterday that it requires on an average one worker for every 10 acres of sugar beets.

The Department of Agriculture has established a goal of 1,069,000 acres of sugar beets that should be planted in 1947. In analyzing our own situation in the State of Colorado we have information from sugar-beet growers to the effect that their present intentions are to plant 209,000 acres, provided they are assured of the necessary labor for the purpose of planting, cultivating, and harvesting the crop.

Now, in analyzing our farm labor situation out there, talking with farm families, the growers themselves, we find that there is reason to assume that we may arrange cooperatively with Texas and some other States for the recruitment of 11,700 workers in other States to be brought into the State of Colorado to do thinning in the spring and summer, and for harvest in the fall. It will require in addition to the 11,700 interstate workers, 6,497 foreign workers, that is the number that has been determined upon as being necessary to produce 209,000 acres of sugar beets in our State.

Now, what applies to Colorado in that respect applies to every other State that grows sugar beets. I have used sugar beets merely as an illustration, for the reason that it is one crop that requires a great deal of the kind of hand labor that our domestic—that we do not have an adequate supply of domestic workers to do, as has been brought out repeatedly, and the average farm worker will not do this kind of work. You cannot compel him to do it, which makes the farmer dependent upon a labor supply from other sources that is willing to do it, and that is the crux of the whole thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a program which is working out all right?

Mr. ANDERSON. Very satisfactorily, and the quality of work done by Mexican nationals that were brought in last year was very satisfactory to the growers, in spite of the fact that they had never seen sugar beets; they don't talk our language; they are not accustomed to the conditions under which they work up here; they do not like the severe weather that is encountered, and that was encountered last year.

Senator THYE. Dr. Anderson, are you not also faced with this question that on the west coast, where you do have a lot of beet crop, and you do have the citrus crop that you must handle, and you do have a lot of the work in the field that was handled by these workers as hand work, that when the war came on you moved all the Japanese, and all of that type of hand workers, that common, everyday labor out of that area because you had to in your national defense program, and you have not yet reestablished those families in the manner that they were prior to the war.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator THYE. And so that the citrus and—yes, all of the growers out there have been in a quandary the last 3, 4 years as to whether they could supply the necessary laborers as the crop demanded it throughout the growing season and the harvest season?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right.

Senator THYE. That is my only concern. If we could reestablish ourselves in a normal manner, I think this program should be out. Now, the question is whether you have reestablished yourself now to an extent that you can completely eliminate the program.

Mr. ANDERSON. We have not; we are still in a period of transition, and as I pointed out yesterday, and as I heard stated by others, there has been a very definite reduction in the number of foreign workers used in each succeeding year because of various conditions.

I made a statement yesterday that there were 150,000 fewer contracted workers, and by that I mean foreign workers and prisoners of war, available and utilized for farm work in 1947 or 1946, and there were fewer then than in 1945; and the number will be further reduced, I am sure, in 1947. But we have not yet readjusted our total labor situation to the point where we do know the exact number of workers that will be available for farm work to handle these competitive crops, and by that I mean crops that require attention simultaneously at various seasons throughout the year.

Now, I mentioned the cost of producing some of these crops and the reluctance of growers to plant crops without having advance assurance that the necessary labor will be forthcoming.

Again using sugar beets as an example, the wages paid for blocking and thinning sugar beets in '46 was \$12 an acre. The first hoeing was \$4.50 an acre, and the second hoeing was \$3 an acre, making a total of \$19.50 per acre to do that particular work.

The cost for topping is on a tonnage basis, and the price paid for that work in the fall of 1946 was at a rate of \$1.45 per ton, and on a 12-ton crop, using that as an average, it would cost \$17.40 to harvest a ton of beets. Well, that makes the total cost of blocking, thinning, hoeing, and harvesting \$36.90. Obviously, farmers are not going to obligate themselves for that amount of expense unless they have assurance that this labor supply that will be needed to plant and cultivate and harvest the crop will be forthcoming, and we know that the supply will not be adequate among the domestic workers of the United States, and that is the reason why it is so important to supplement our domestic-labor supply in 1946 with the number of foreign workers that will be required to produce the crops.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they going to have any difficulty in taking care of that? Are you going to have any difficulty in taking care of that need?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I am sure that there is a very receptive attitude on the part of farmers everywhere to produce the acreages that have been requested and that they will put forth their best efforts in so doing. We have very favorable weather conditions, more favorable this spring than ordinary. We have every indication of abundant production, willingness on the part of all concerned to do that which should be done. We have a great need, as far as our domestic needs are concerned; we have an even greater need for export of certain crops because of the situation that applies generally throughout the world.

Senator YOUNG. Do you not think, Dr. Anderson, that if given sufficient time and warning that farm-placement bureau could work out this program in another year?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I do not like to answer that question.

Senator YOUNG. I mention that because I think it is going to be increasingly difficult to get special appropriations like that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Congress assigned this particular job to the Co-operative Extension Service. We have tried to carry it out to the best of our ability. We think that it has been pretty well done; at least, that seems to be the attitude of the farmers, and this is an emergency program that started in 1943. It has been carried on during each succeeding year.

The present authorization is until June 30, 1947. We just cannot plant a crop and then not have the necessary labor with which to harvest a crop that may be planted, and it is absolutely necessary, we think, that this program be extended through the remainder of the calendar year in order to give everybody assurance that workers that may be brought in for the spring work will be held over for the fall work and complete the job.

Senator YOUNG. I believe you, Doctor, but I do believe you should try to work out a program with the Farm Placement Bureau. That is my personal belief.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to mention one other thing, if I may, in connection with the Senate bill. I believe that the House bill, as passed by the House the other day, requires that the entire program be liquidated by December 31, 1947, whereas the Senate bill provides a 90-day liquidation period beyond January 1 or beyond December 31, 1947.

Now, out in our sugar-beet country we do need the workers as late as the middle of December under normal conditions, and it would seriously interfere with the completion of the harvest if we were compelled to release the foreign workers that might be brought in before the harvest is completed, and for that reason it is absolutely necessary that the workers who are brought in be permitted to remain as long as they are needed in 1947, which, as I say, out in our country, would be about December 15, and that applies to a good many States. So, obviously, the liquidation period would have to follow the completion of the harvest.

Senator THYE. Dr. Anderson, could the bill be so written to take care of the harvest season of 1947? Then it would be mandatory in this Midwest, in the middle section of the United States, where your harvest season would be completed in November—sugar beets are all in practically in October; in most of the Northwest in October or by the first week of November.

Mr. ANDERSON. They start harvesting the first week in November.

Senator THYE. And if it could be completed, then, and the office closed up that would complete it.

Mr. ANDERSON. They have been released each year when there was no longer any need for them in the particular area.

Senator THYE. That is right. But to close the office specifically so that you could commence in the Middle States of the Union to close those offices in December, and if you needed to go into January and close the offices in those Western States then, that you would be able to do it.

Mr. ANDERSON. But to have a law that compels a complete liquidation of the program in all respects on December 31, 1947, would not be feasible.

Senator THYE. Close the office upon the completion of the harvest in that particular area.

Mr. ANDERSON. In each area.

Senator THYE. In each area.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. Dr. Anderson, of course, we all believe in the free-enterprise system. You, as do others, believe in that, do you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. The war has been over 2 years. Is it not about time that we were returning to the system of free enterprise if we are going to get back to it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I am not competent to interpret all that is involved in what is referred to as free enterprise. Certainly, farmers are engaged in free enterprise.

Senator KEM. And they want to continue.

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know whether you were here, Senator, when I made this statement, and I would like to repeat it, if I may. I think you referred to and you used the word "subsidy" yesterday. We do not think that this is a subsidized program in the sense that subsidies generally apply to legislation enacted by Congress.

I made a statement before you came in, I think, that we think of this as a service to farmers that only the Federal Government can render, and to provide funds for the purpose of making labor available to our farmers that otherwise would not be available. In other words, you have got to have an act of Congress to permit this Government to negotiate with another Government for the importation of workers that are needed, and there must be expense incurred.

Senator KEM. That is one phase of it, but how about the expense? Should not the expense be borne by the industry itself and by the consumers of the products?

Mr. ANDERSON. Farmers have been compelled to pay more for foreign labor than they have for our domestic labor because of the requirements of the program itself.

Senator KEM. Should that not be an expense borne by the industry and by the producers?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is.

Senator KEM. And by the consumers of the products?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not reasonable to require farmers to assume added expense because of conditions over which they have no control.

Senator KEM. Is it reasonable to take the money out of the United States Treasury for that purpose in a free enterprise system?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that if food is essential, and we all recognize that it is not only for our own domestic people but in other parts of the country, that if circumstances prevail that are beyond the control of the individual engaged in the free enterprise, he certainly is justified in calling upon his Government to help him share the additional expense that must be incurred.

Senator YOUNG. Sugar is not a free-enterprise commodity; you have a ceiling over it. If the profits were large enough the grower could afford to pay almost any high wages.

Senator AIKEN. Senator Kem, before you came in I called attention to the fact that we are subsidizing industry to the amount of over a billion dollars a year, thereby enabling industry to outbid the farmers for labor, and so long as the question of subsidies as a whole is with us, and of course it is a debatable question, we cannot subsidize one factor of our economy to give him an unfair advantage over another factor, and so on.

Senator BUSHFIELD. That is the very point I was trying to make.

Senator AIKEN. Your sugar man has a ceiling on his product and these other subsidized industries for the most part have had their ceilings removed.

Senator BUSHFIELD. When Senator Thomas said that they brought their combines and their harvesters up from Texas to Oklahoma and Kansas and the Dakotas and Nebraska, the employers paid for that.

Senator AIKEN. That is right.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Now, we are asking the Government to step in and pay for those foreign laborers.

Senator AIKEN. Yes, but the Government subsidized last year in the amount of a hundred million dollars lead, zinc, and copper production to enable lead, zinc, and copper miners to outbid the farmers for the labor in those very areas. I can name areas where your copper miners, your lead miners, and your zinc miners are outbidding them.

Senator KEM. Your whole structure under the New Deal was set up under the basis of special privileges to certain groups.

Senator AIKEN. No; the subsidies for industry preceded the New Deal by a long period.

Senator KEM. That is right, and we have had this special privilege going up in our Government for many years.

Senator AIKEN. That is right.

Senator KEM. And there are a lot of us who think that the time has been reached when we have got to turn back, and we have got to reverse the process and try to balance this thing. I do not believe that this is an appropriate time for you and me to engage in a discussion of this kind.

Senator AIKEN. No.

Senator KEM. And I would suggest we examine Dr. Anderson and get his views on it.

Senator AIKEN. My suggestion was that the Government should not have money to subsidize the lead and zinc mine operator so that he can hire away the help from around him, without helping the farmers too.

Senator KEM. I anticipate that your views and mine are highly divergent, and we would not be apt to reach agreement.

Senator AIKEN. I am not sure that I would not go along with you in doing away with all subsidies such as guaranteeing of bank loans, and so forth.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to make this statement: Farmers would like to be relieved of the necessity of utilizing foreign labor. It costs every farmer who uses foreign labor more money to employ that class of labor than it does our domestic labor.

Senator KEM. Now, Dr. Anderson—

Mr. ANDERSON. He is willing to do it because there is not an adequate supply of our own.

Senator KEM. Let me say that I am a farmer myself; I was raised in the country and have been associated in that industry all my life, so I am perfectly friendly to that point of view.

On the other hand, I get, as I am sure other Senators do, a great many letters complaining about high taxes; complaining about restrictions on agriculture; difficulties under which the industry is being carried on; and calling for a lessening of these taxes and a reduction of the restrictions.

Now, we have got to start somewhere, and what I would like to get is your view as to whether this is not an appropriate time to begin the process of releasing these controls.

Now, what I have in mind is, the war has been over 2 years; this is essentially a special privilege to a certain group of the agricultural industry at the expense of the Treasury. If it is necessary to bring these laborers in, as it well may be as you say, should it not be done at the expense of the industry involved, and the people buying the products rather than at the expense of the Treasury as a whole?

Mr. ANDERSON. For the time being, my answer to your question is no, for the simple reason that there is more added expense involved than the growers can or should assume; that they will and have continued to assume their proportionate share; but they cannot assume the total amount that is involved in the recruitment and the transportation of workers from foreign countries at the present time. We are still in a period of transition.

Senator KEM. How long do you anticipate that period to last?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, it is merely an opinion, but I suspect, I personally do not believe, that we will ever have as many people back on the farms doing farm work as we did have during the war, and that farmers will experience difficulty for—

Senator KEM. Well, is it a sound principle to encourage our farmers to rely on imported contract labor?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; only through extreme necessity, and that is what we are confronted with now. As I have tried to say, farmers would like to be relieved of the necessity of using foreign labor, but they are not yet in a position to do so; they cannot produce the crops that should be produced with our available domestic labor supply at the present time. It is absolutely necessary to supplement our domestic labor supply for this year, at least, with a limited number of foreign workers.

Senator KEM. You do not think it would be possible to work this out on a basis of the Government's furnishing the direction and the information and the service, and the industry itself paying the cost?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is too much expense involved, Senator, and it is not, it would not be a fair thing to ask the growers to do, because they are already incurring more expense in proportion to their net income than they should be required to pay in the utilization of this type of labor.

Senator YOUNG. Under ceilings imposed upon them.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is right. They are limited in their gross income, you see, and in their net income under the conditions that apply to the sugar program.

Senator KEM. Well, the only crop on which a ceiling is involved is sugar, is it not? There is no limitation on the gross income otherwise, is there?

Mr. ANDERSON. Only as the market imposes limitations.

Senator AIKEN. You have a fixed price in dairy products.

Senator KEM. You have got a free market on everything else, have you not?

Mr. ANDERSON. When you have got a million acres that ought to be planted in sugar beets and it requires that great amount of hand labor in order to produce the crop you are not going to get it until you provide the labor.

Senator KEM. Well, shouldn't we encourage or stimulate the use of domestic labor rather than encourage and stimulate the use of for-

eign contract labor? Should we not spend any money that we do spend in the direction towards getting jobs for these 3,000,000 people that are out of work today?

Mr. ANDERSON. If anything could have been done that has not been done, in the greatest possible utilization of domestic labor of every kind, men, women, and youth in this emergency farm labor program, I do not know what it could be, and I think that the response on the part of the public, from the standpoint of workers, people not ordinarily engaged in farm work, the effort put forth by farmers in producing the crops that were required during the war, is one of the finest tributes that could possibly be paid to farmers and workers alike.

Senator KEM. There is no question about that. But is it not a sound policy to let the American farmers know that the Government is not going to encourage and pay the expense of importation of contract labor in peacetime?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, we are not far enough along in what might be referred to as peacetime to be on a stable basis, and until we get stabilized in all respects, we are going to have these special problems to deal with.

Senator KEM. Let me ask you this: Do you find in your contact with farmers a dissatisfaction with the tax burden?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, nobody likes to pay more taxes than they are compelled to pay.

Senator KEM. Do you find a very considerable protest against the present burden?

Mr. ANDERSON. No.

Senator KEM. You don't find that?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not using the literal meaning of the word "protest." I think that farmers, in common with urban people, realize that the war cost a lot of money and the debts have got to be paid, and they have got to pay their proportionate share of it for whatever time it may take to do it.

Senator KEM. You do not interpret the last election as a demand on the part of the people for lower taxes?

Mr. ANDERSON. I don't know of an individual that would not be very receptive to lower taxes, but we have an enormous obligation that has got to be met, and it cannot be met without adequate taxation for the purpose of so doing.

Senator KEM. Well, it cannot be met by payments out of the Treasury, either, can it?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Is not this same program being used in regard to citrus fruit?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Then your argument in regard to sugar beets—

Mr. ANDERSON. I just used that as an illustration.

Senator AIKEN. I would like to add, too, that it has been used in dairying; that there has been a shortage of labor on the dairy farms, and that labor has been brought in from Newfoundland—largely from Newfoundland and Canada in the Northwest; and there is a price fixed on milk as well as on sugar.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, we have even closed our schools year after year to take care of the beet and potato harvest.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, sir.

Senator KEM. There was not any evidence here yesterday of any importation of labor from Newfoundland.

Senator AIKEN. We have been using Newfoundland labor up in the Northeast.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You pay for this labor the same as Mexicans?

Senator AIKEN. We pay the prevailing wage, but the Government makes arrangements.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But the Government does not pay for it.

Senator KEM. We were not told about it.

Senator THYE. Well, the Mexicans and the people from Jamaica were the greatest sources of manpower available under such an agreement with our Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. Particularly Mexico.

Senator THYE. We must not lose sight of this one fact, that it is not a question of one individual hiring one man; it is more a question of a cannery, and I will be specific, and say suppose in the cannery at Rochester, Minn., it needs 150 men to handle the vines from the field to the crop and then on into the plant. They cannot hire enough people locally to do the job. I mean they cannot find enough men to do the job, so they have to rely on either the concentration of this help, whether it comes from Mexico, Jamaica, or where it comes from, but they have got to concentrate it.

Now, who concentrates it? Rochester Cannery cannot do it because in the first place, they would not have the law to permit them to bring the people in from Mexico or to bring them in from Jamaica, so they have to have a law whereby the Government will permit some agency to do it, and the extension department is the agency that does the job. So, they proceed to bring in 150 men into that area to do the field work of loading the vines onto the trucks to bring them into the plant.

Likewise when you are harvesting your sweet corn. You have got to have the men in the field to snap it; sweet corn comes at a harvest time in the Middle West where you are in the area, the agricultural harvest area, so the result is that the harvest field is competing with the canneries in getting the sweet corn out. There has not been the available help. There has got to be and there must be an agency responsible for the concentration of that help, and the Extension Department has been the agency so responsible.

Personally, I have raised the question many times in my mind, and I did last year. Last year, as a governor, I had to sit down with the extension department in my State to ascertain what the manpower situation would be in our State for the year. Our final conclusion was that it was not adequate, so the result was reported it in here to the Federal Government, and the result was that we proceeded to be a part of the program in the State. I think you are faced with the same situation.

The only error is that if we should have discontinued the program, if we were to have discontinued the program, it should have been done by a congressional act in the Seventy-ninth Congress and abolished it effective at the end of the harvest season of the year of 1946,

and then the farmer and the cannery and everybody else would have adjusted their acreage and their program to meet the needs of today and tomorrow and throughout the balance of the harvest year.

It has not been done. You are in, up until the middle of the year, next July 31. From there on out you have no appropriation. Are you going to quit in the middle of the season or are you going to continue to the end of the harvest season?

If you continue to the end of the harvest season, you have got to enact and continue the law for 6 months. Now, that is the question that is before you, and the farmers are not getting this help except at it serves the farmer, and the cannery, and the agency of the extension department aids in the concentration of this help in areas where they need it and I beg of each and every one of the committee members to forgive me, and I apologize for making this sort of a statement here, but I am still familiar with it, and I could not help but bring it out.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very much impressed, Senator, with your knowledge and the purpose of the program.

Senator THYE. I have lived it and lived with it for 4 years, sir. And I know it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish that every other Member of Congress were equally informed, because with the information that I know you possess, and my knowledge of the conditions that apply in Minnesota because we have gotten that information from Minnesota, as we have from many other States, we know the desperate need of farmers for a continuation of this program throughout 1947, and it would be extremely unfortunate and unfair to the farmers of the United States if Congress did not support them in their effort to have this legislation extended to protect them, their interests, and to assure the production of the crops that are so badly needed.

Senator KEM. Just a minute, Dr. Anderson, about the subsidy feature of this: Of course, we all know that agriculture has needed help in the past, needed it badly, desperately, and has gotten it, and it has been very helpful. In all probability it will need it some time in the future, and we all hope that the Government will be in a position to respond even then as it has in the past.

Does it need it now? Is it wise to continue a subsidy program when the prices of the farm products are such as they are today?

Mr. ANDERSON. This is not a subsidy, Senator Kem. It is a service that is requested of the Congress of the United States and it involves the expenditure of some money; not a large sum, to supplement the added expense that farmers themselves must incur in having this particular service made available to them, I think.

Senator KEM. Of course \$12,000,000 in 6 months is not exactly hay.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but comparatively small in relation to the total amount of expense that has to be incurred by the farmer's in producing these crops.

Senator KEM. You say this is not a subsidy. How do you define a subsidy?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think of a subsidy as money made available to somebody to supplement their own income.

Senator KEM. Well, now, is not that exactly what this is?

Mr. ANDERSON. No, sir.

Senator KEM. This is a payment out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. For the purpose of rendering a specific service.

Senator KEM. Part of the expense; well, the service is all right. But how about the payment for transportation and subsistence of the laborer himself? Is not that a part of his compensation?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is expense of a character for which there is no justification, in my opinion, and I think I speak for the farmers of the United States when I make that statement; the expense of the character that they cannot and should not be expected to assume, and that it is an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to help them to share the added expense with them for the purpose of supplying the labor or what is necessary.

Senator KEM. Well, assuming that it is an obligation, and assuming that it is a duty, assuming that it ought to be done, it is still a subsidy, is it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, I do not consider it a subsidy.

Senator KEM. In your definition of a subsidy it is.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, it does not.

Senator YOUNG. Senator Kem, may I ask you this question?

Now, over in the Supreme Court Building you have a law library which is for service to lawyers. Is that a subsidy or is it not?

Senator KEM. Of course, the Government furnishes a lot of services, and furnishes a lot of subsidies.

Senator YOUNG. Well, that service is a subsidy to probably the best paid men in the United States.

Senator KEM. Over the front of the Supreme Court Building is the legend, "Equal Protection of the Laws for All."

Senator YOUNG. You do not find many farmers over there; it is mostly business and labor. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much for a very interesting statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Thank you, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we have Mr. Wilson, Deputy Director of Extension of the United States Department of Agriculture.

STATEMENT OF MEREDITH C. WILSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EXTENSION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILSON. My name is Meredith C. Wilson, Deputy Director of Extension, United States Department of Agriculture.

As Mr. Overby explained yesterday, the emergency farm labor program is divided into two parts, the domestic labor program and the foreign labor program. I happen to be responsible for the domestic labor program, so I will speak largely from that point of view.

The CHAIRMAN. How is that division made?

Mr. WILSON. Domestic labor is the labor that is local labor, intra-state, and interstate which moves between the States. The foreign labor program is the labor brought in from Mexico, Jamaica, a few from Newfoundland, a few from Canada; there are also a few Barbadians and miscellaneous workers.

I have a prepared statement for the committee, and it contains a few figures. I think the figures will be much more interesting to the group

if I show them in chart form. The statistical tables will appear in the manuscript, and I will present the same data from the charts.

Before moving into the details of the domestic labor program, I would like to reemphasize with all the power at my command one point that Mr. Overby and Director Anderson have made before this committee, and that is the remarkable, in fact, almost miraculous, job done by American agriculture during the past 4 or 5 years.

I think that can be illustrated very nicely from this chart. Here is your base line of 100 which represents the average situation during the period 1935 to 1939.

This solid black line represents the index of total agricultural production year by year from 1941 to 1946. Notice that 1941 production was 113 percent—13 percent above the 1935–39 average.

In 1942 it moved up to 124 percent, the then all-time high record of production on American farms. As we moved into the emergency period of 1943, when this program started, farmers were asked to even exceed the previous all-time record of 1942, agricultural production in 1943 moved up to 128 percent.

In 1944 it moved up to 134 percent, and in 1945 and 1946 it was much above 1943.

This line here—the green line—is food. If you are interested in the index for food production, follow the green line.

This blue line represents the labor supply on farms during this same period. It started out in 1941 5 percent below the 1939 average; agricultural labor had been drawn off into industry.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Also drawn off into the Army.

Mr. WILSON. The Army took part. The farm work force kept falling and reached the low point here in the fall of 1945 of 10 percent below the 1935–39 base period.

Now, if you will relate the index of total agricultural production to the labor supply, you get this red ratio line, which indicates, for the four-year period, 1943 to 1945, that production in terms of available labor exceeded the prewar period by an average of 44 percent.

In other words, during that period, two men on American farms did essentially what three did prior to the war. Those two men were help of poorer quality, old men and youth—who accomplished record agricultural production in the face of shortages of fertilizer, machinery, and other things.

I simply present to you, gentlemen, this picture in this manner because I believe we lay all too little stress on this record of agricultural accomplishment during the war period.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that this record production was not the result of adding more labor, but of getting greater production per unit of labor.

Senator YOUNG. Was not it a fact that these crops were produced at the time when ceilings were imposed upon farmers?

Mr. WILSON. You are, I think, quite familiar with that whole price structure during that period, and with the subsidy programs, and so forth. I think the farmers—well you are familiar with that, and it would be a long story, so I will not go into it.

Now, I should like to say just a few words about the set-up of the program.

Senator PEPPER. May I interrupt you just 1 minute, Mr. Chairman. I thoroughly agree that the major credit for that great record is due to the patriotic exertions on the part of the farmer and the farm people in this country. But isn't there another factor that is worth mentioning, which I hope we can continue to preserve, and that is that generally speaking, the farmers had almost unlimited markets for what they could grow, and if we could give the agriculture of this country markets for what they can grow and tell them to go out and grow everything they can, would not we continue to maintain a magnificent record of agricultural production in this country?

Mr. WILSON. Of course, we had a situation during the war where the demand for agricultural production was almost unlimited.

Senator YOUNG. And unusually favorable crop years. We had favorable weather and we had the advantages of other things.

Mr. WILSON. We had very favorable weather, we had favorable crop years, and we had the advantages of certain technological improvements such as hybrid corn. But we did have the need for unlimited production, not only for our own needs, but to take care of the world situation. There is still a demand for food to export to other countries.

Senator PEPPER. Do you not think we should strive to assure the agriculture of this country of the same unlimited markets and the same challenge to all other production in peacetime as well as in wartime, and that our farm program should be aimed at not the curtailment of agricultural production but encouragement of agricultural production, because surely not only people in this country but the people of the world need food in all possible abundance?

Mr. WILSON. I believe that point of view would reflect the attitude of most farmers. Farmers are in a producing business, and they like to produce abundantly.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, apart from what you have just been talking about, just in different language, as I recall, we had evidence presented to the committee last year to show that in '44 and '45, with 6,000,000 farmers less, we produced a third more food than we did before the war. Now, all of that, to my way of thinking, is due to the markets that the farmers had for it and, of course, everybody did all—in fact, every farmer did all he could to produce all that was possible because he had the proper market for it.

Mr. WILSON. Now, if I may say a word about the organizational side of the farm-labor program. The Agricultural Extension Service in each State is responsible for the conduct of the program within that State, and the county agent is in charge in each county. He is assisted by an advisory committee of farmers and other leaders, including the neighborhood leader system of the Extension Service, that was set up at the outset of the war to provide the Secretary of Agriculture with a clear, direct-line channel to every last farm family on food-production matters.

Now, the county agent employs from time to time county farm-labor assistants, and, of course, the number of those and the length of their employment depends upon the labor load in the county.

There are about 2,100, I believe, of the 3,000 agricultural counties that now have functioning farm-labor advisory committees. There are nearly 90,000 community and neighborhood leaders—those are

the voluntary unpaid leaders—assisting with the program in the county. There are 19,000 communities that have definitely organized programs under the Extension Service for the exchange of local labor and machinery.

Now, within each county, the county agent and his farm-labor assistant, with the aid of the committeemen, determine the labor requirements. They develop possible plans of meeting those labor needs for the season; they place all labor made available to that county from the outside, including the foreign labor, reference to which has been made earlier.

Now, every possible effort is made to solve farm-labor problems locally by neighborhood and community exchange of labor and machinery, by recruiting unusual sources of labor locally—youth, women, and townspeople—but when the labor supply within the county is insufficient, the county agent certifies to the State extension office for out-of-county workers.

When a State cannot meet its farm-labor requirements by transferring workers among counties, the State director of the extension service certifies to the Federal Extension Service in the case of workers from other States, and to the labor branch, if it is a question of foreign workers, for additional out-of-State workers.

During 1943, 1944, and 1945, there was little danger of any over-certification of out-of-State workers since the supply of agricultural workers was gradually getting shorter and shorter. As the season advanced, a State probably needed even more workers than had been requested at an earlier date. But with the domestic labor supply slowly improving as veterans and war-industry workers returned to the farm, the reverse situation has become true, and certifications for foreign workers during these past 2 years have been kept just as low as possible.

There has been more shifting of foreign workers to take care of emergency harvest situations, they are a very flexible group, they can be shifted quickly to take care of emergency situations.

Now, our State directors of extensions are fully awake to the unfavorable public reaction that would result should foreign workers be employed on those jobs returning servicemen and war workers were capable and desirous of performing. We are all very sensitive to that situation.

Senator THYE. Let me make one inquiry for the sake of information. Now, in your Extension Department, if you were working in any area where you knew that a certain season of the year would make a demand upon the manpower in that area, you would make a survey of the manpower available and ascertain whether you had sufficient manpower available in that area to supply the need for that specific season of the year.

In the event your division, and I say your division, because it is the Extension, found that you could not find sufficient manpower in that area you would then proceed to recruit the manpower and have it ready to be brought into the area as the season demanded it. That is where the expense, the administrative expense, so far as your division is concerned, is, in connection with this manpower question.

Mr. WILSON. That is exactly right.

Now, the funds provided for in section 2 in our Farm Labor Supply Act are allocated to the States on the basis of need, and are handled in the same manner as regular Extension funds that are appropriated to the States under the Smith-Lever, Capper-Ketchum and related acts. The Federal Extension Service checks the State plans of work and budget requests, reviews expenditures, coordinates the effort of the States, facilitates movements of workers across State lines, transports interstate workers, analyzes reports and other pertinent data, and performs the general function of a clearinghouse for information and counsel among the 48 States.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But the movement, domestic laborers, the transportation and handling of them, would all be handled by the employers themselves; would they not?

Mr. WILSON. All except a few cases where in the late fall to meet emergency situations in the potato harvest, fruit harvest and sugar-beet harvest, the areas needing those workers were so far removed from any possible source of extra workers and there was not any possibility of taking care of the situation with foreign workers that were already in the area, it has been necessary to transport a small number of interstate workers. I think the number in 1945 was less than 10,000, just for very short periods to meet emergency situations where because of distance, the transportation cost involved would be greater than the individual employer could be expected to pay and greater than the individual worker could be expected to pay.

Senator YOUNG. Are there any prisoners of war in this country?

Mr. WILSON. At the beginning of the year we were informed that they would not be available. However, there was some delay in returning them, and the War Department made available about 19,000 for use up until June 15 which was to be the final date; but a few of them did work until early July. The War Department had no funds for transporting those prisoners of war from where they were then located to areas of employment. We took care of transporting the prisoners under this program as part of our interstate labor movement.

There are two ways of meeting a farm-labor shortage. One is by making additional workers available to an area, and the other is by stretching the existing supply of labor through more efficient utilization.

I would like to say a few words, first, about making additional workers available. During the course of a year, the Extension Service operates between seven and eight thousand county and local farm-labor offices, where farmers make their needs for extra labor known, and through which those workers recruited locally, brought in from outside the area, domestic and foreign, are placed on farm jobs.

During 1946 agricultural labor was supplied to approximately 500,000 farmers. Those were the larger farmers, of course, that needed labor beyond that supplied by the operator and his own family, also the farmers who were unable to recruit and make their own arrangements for local labor.

There were 4,900,000 farm-labor placements made. A placement is one worker connected with one job. That involved—and these next figures are estimates because it is very difficult to eliminate duplication—that involved an estimated 2,700,000 workers that were

handled through this program, of whom about 1,650,000 were men, 700,000 youths, and 350,000 women.

Senator YOUNG. Is that the program of both the Farm Placement Service and the Extension?

Mr. WILSON. All farm-labor placements are handled through the Extension Service, and I am reporting on the total.

Senator YOUNG. That is also the Farm Placement Bureau.

Mr. WILSON. During the war period the agricultural-labor program has been handled through the Department of Agriculture and State extension services under Public Law 229. The United States Employment Service is involved in only a few States where the State extension service contracts with the State employment service for a limited amount of special recruitment and placement work. That is usually done only in areas where the Employment Service has offices and qualified men who can help out in special situations. I intend to discuss that point a bit later.

Now, the figures I have just given you include 19,000 prisoners of war I referred to as having been made available in the spring, included also are the foreign workers from the West Indies, Mexico, and the few workers from Canada, Newfoundland, Honduras, and so forth. The figures include the interstate workers that were transported for harvest work, about 10,000 of them. The placement figures also include the experienced domestic agricultural workers, and the inexperienced youths, women, and townspeople who, as a result of all kinds of Extension recruitment efforts, helped to get the job done.

The placement figures, however, do not include an additional estimated 500,000 persons whom we believe were influenced by the various Extension information campaigns in the newspaper and over the radio, and so forth, to perform farm work but who did not clear through farm-labor offices. Neither do these figures include the migratory workers who make their own employment arrangements, even though Extension information helped to direct them to areas needing labor—areas in short supply.

We have been talking so far about making additional labor available. I want to say something now about stretching the available labor supply, because I think it is so evident from the chart that it was not the additional workers that made possible this production, but rather increased output per man that really accounted for our record agricultural production during the war period.

By that I do not mean that these additional workers did not render a great service. We needed every additional able-bodied man we could get, and these additional able-bodied men became a flexible force that could be shifted around in some of these areas where you could not get adequate labor or where the character of the work was such that it could not be done by women, townspeople, and youths.

I think this point is further emphasized by the fact that agricultural production on American farms required in 1 year 2,250,000,000 man-days of labor. The labor supplied through this program, by both the foreign and domestic labor parts of the program, added all together, only contributed from 130 to 160 million man-days of labor per year, leaving something like 2,100,000,000 man-days of labor that were performed by the farmers, members of the farm families, and by the workers that the farmer was able to arrange for who did not clear through the system of farm-labor offices.

That point is emphasized very nicely by these two charts. This first chart is a diagrammatic picture of the farm-labor supply from all sources, month by month as the season developed in 1944. Notice the spring peaks here in May and June, and even the higher peak in September and October. This picture would be good for any recent year.

The red represents the farm operators, about 6,000,000 of them. The wine-colored represents the members of the farm family who work on farms. You notice how flexible that is because you see how it builds up here and again here to take care of peak situations. Relatives—men, youth, and women—those who may be living on the farm and working somewhere else, use their vacation periods to help out during those peaks.

The blue represents the hired labor that the farmer arranges for if he is able to arrange for it himself. Some workers get their own jobs.

The green represents the recruited intrastate workers and prisoners of war. The yellow strip represents the foreign labor, and the interstate transported workers.

Just notice how relatively small the green and yellow areas are in relation to the total. That extra labor is exceedingly important, but, after all, it is only a small part of the total. There was no possible way of adding enough workers to take care of this job during the emergency.

The way it had to be done was by stretching this 8 to 10 million farmers, members of farm families and hired hands—stretching this labor to make it accomplish more by longer hours, labor-saving devices, short cuts, and better work methods. I think this second chart will support that explanation.

This chart happens to be for the year 1945, exactly the same picture would do for any recent year. This pie, this circle represents the total labor required for agricultural production; the black represents the number of available workers, including the foreign workers, the prisoners-of-war, and everything in sight. But, with all of that, we still had this gap to close, equal to about 300,000 year-around workers, and the only way that could be closed was by increasing the output per worker sufficiently to offset the short supply of labor.

For these reasons we believe we have been more than justified in centering our extension efforts very largely in this area of efficient utilization of labor in order to increase the output per man.

I shall not attempt to review all of the wide range of farm labor utilization activities that have been involved in the domestic farm-labor program of the Extension Service, but I would like to cite a few examples from different parts of the country to illustrate accomplishments or approaches during the past several years.

At the very beginning of the program in North Carolina, the Extension Service organized every single community and neighborhood in that State for the exchange of labor, and machinery because it felt that the farm-labor problem in that State would have to be solved very largely locally rather than through the recruitment and placement of additional workers.

The State extension service made a survey at the end of the season and found that 66 percent of the 278,000 farms in that State had labor

problems during the year. It was also found that on 75 percent of the farms having labor problems the situation had been met by the exchange of labor and equipment locally, arranged through the extension program.

The CHAIRMAN. What State is that?

Mr. WILSON. North Carolina. That work was equivalent to 4,000,000 man-days of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got anything out in the farm belt?

Mr. WILSON. I will mention a couple more States in just a minute.

In North Dakota, for example, as a result of extension activities, extension agents, and the local leaders taught farmers how to build 7,045 major units of equipment, such as buck rakes, during 1 year. That project effected a man replacement of 18,000 harvest workers.

Here is a very interesting, and, to me, one of the most striking examples I have. During 1944, the Kentucky Experiment Station, cooperating with the farm work simplification laboratory at Purdue University, developed better work methods for all operations involved in the growing, harvesting, and marketing of burley tobacco.

The CHAIRMAN. Who developed this?

Mr. WILSON. Kentucky, the Kentucky Experiment Station, working with the farm-work simplification laboratory at Purdue University.

Senator KEM. You will tie all these facts into the bill that we have got under discussion later, will you?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I am explaining how the farm-labor program has been operated, and particularly the domestic program handled by the cooperative agricultural extension service.

The following year the Kentucky Extension Service put on an extensive campaign to teach the tobacco farmers how to use these better methods. In 1 year they got 82,800 of the total of 360,000 acres of burley tobacco grown in Kentucky handled by these new methods at a saving of 9 days of labor per acre. If you multiply 82,800 by 9, you get something like 740,000 man-days of labor saved on one crop in 1 year.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, these are exceedingly interesting figures.

The CHAIRMAN. This is one of the most interesting statements that has come before this committee.

Senator KEM. I wonder if we could not get down to this bill for the benefit of those of us who have to leave.

Mr. WILSON. If you wish, I shall jump over some of these illustrations.

I would like to call attention to just one matter that was mentioned this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, how long a period has your service covered in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I have been under civil service for 33 years, Senator Capper, starting out as an assistant county agent in Tomkins County, N. Y., moving to New Hampshire as county agent leader, and then coming to the Department of Agriculture in 1918. I was drafted from my other work at the beginning of the war period to handle the domestic farm-labor program.

Senator KEM. Those are exceedingly interesting figures, and being presented in a way that—

The CHAIRMAN. They are appropriate to this problem we are covering.

Senator YOUNG. And before leaving tobacco, I would like to add this: That the Government collects about a billion dollars in revenue off the tobacco crop.

Senator KEM. It seems to me the crux of the question here is whether this is a proper charge on the Treasury as a whole; that is really the point the members of the committee are most interested in.

Mr. WILSON. If you wish I will skip these other examples, but I would like to have the full statement included in the hearings. I have selected 9 or 10 of them here. There could just as well have been 50. However, I should like to mention just 2 more.

This morning reference was made to the combine program in the Plains States. The extension services of those States from Texas through to North Dakota, with the help of the Federal offices have, for the past 3 years, conducted a comprehensive campaign of surveying needs, locating combines, and routing combines so that throughout the entire area from Texas to North Dakota the available machines, including a few hundred Canadian combines, have been utilized to the best possible advantage.

Senator BUSHFIELD. But the farmers themselves paid for the use of those combines.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; absolutely.

Senator BUSHFIELD. What I mean to say is the United States Treasury was not called upon to pay for them.

Mr. WILSON. We simply found out where combines were needed; furnished them information to combine owners and wheat growers; kept the machines fully employed; and got the harvest job done without loss of food.

Senator KEM. Is there any more reason why part of the subsistence and traveling expense of a laborer should be paid out of the Treasury than those combines should be paid for?

Senator THYE. I might, for the sake of the record, say one thing. I would rather examine this one question, Senator Kem, and that is that there had to be an agency that ascertained where the combines were, and where the harvest acres would be, and where the machines would have to go in order to find the job. And your agency, the Extension Department, did that.

For your information, I happened to drive from Oklahoma City last year, after having attended the Governors' conference, and I came up a highway from Oklahoma City through to Nebraska and then on across the corner of South Dakota, into Minnesota, and I tell you that on many and many a half mile distance I found as many as six and seven combines coming in from North Dakota, South Dakota, going into the Panhandle area of Texas, to commence the harvest, and those same machines traveled clear back from the Panhandle harvesting all the way back to Canada through the seasons until they had cleared and wound up in Canada in the late fall.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Let me say, Governor Thye, those combines found their own jobs. The Department didn't find them.

Senator THYE. Senator Kem, let me answer the good Senator Bushfield on that question. That was absolutely true, because I happened to have a lot of friends in that Midwest country, and the first year

that those combines went down, Senator Bushfield, they went down because the Extension Department said that there were a million acres of wheat down here in the Panhandle that will not be harvested unless the combines of North and South Dakota and Canada come down.

The first year they went down was because of the available information made as to acreage; the second year they went down because they had been there the year before, and they had a specific invitation and a contract to come back; and in fact, many of your men from South Dakota—I could name them by name, in fact, if I wanted to—have been down there for the past 3 years, first starting with one combine, and then winding up with two combines and their own trucks and all, and they contract to do the acreage at so much an acre in delivering the grain to the elevator. But the Extension agency built up the exchange of machines throughout the Nation to begin with, and then the program more or less carried itself.

Senator KEM. Mr. Wilson, assuming that it is a perfectly proper function for the Government to arrange for the proper distribution of these combines, let me ask you this question: With the present price of wheat, would you regard it as proper that a subsidy be paid out of the Treasury of the United States for the use of those combines or part of the rent or a part of the wages of people to operate them?

Mr. WILSON. It is not my judgment that it would be necessary, and it has not been done through this program at any time.

Senator KEM. Is there any distinction between that and paying the subsistence and transportation and medical care of a laborer into the wheat field, say?

Mr. WILSON. I would like to answer that question in this way: We have been trying to get all of this added production during the war period to take care of war needs, not only of our own people and our armed services, but people in other nations. I wonder if you would not be just as fair in saying that this cost of bringing in these few thousand foreign workers to help get this top crest of production was part of our cost of getting four or five hundred million extra bushels of wheat available for Europe.

Senator KEM. That is a war cost. Now, is it possible and proper for us to continue those cost 2 years later?

Mr. WILSON. I think we should taper off and get back to peacetime as rapidly as possible.

Senator KEM. Do you think we are doing it with the price of wheat as it is?

Mr. WILSON. We are making progress. As Director Anderson pointed out, last year we accomplished a record harvest in October with 150,000 fewer contract workers, prisoners of war, and foreign workers than we had before. I anticipate a further reduction will be made this year.

Senator YOUNG. In defense of my own area, I think it is of national concern to conserve this wheat if for no other reason than to hold the price down. If you want higher-priced wheat, let the wheat go to waste. Now, these combines were brought up there by the Extension Service on a guaranty in many cases that they would find work for them, and the county agent in my county tells these combine operators where they can find work.

Mr. WILSON. I might illustrate the combine program by mentioning the biggest center of that combine movement, which is in western Kansas. The State extension service operates a wheat-harvest office at Great Bend with ample personnel during the harvest period. That office is in daily contact with all of the counties in the area where the harvest is under way. They know when the harvest will start throughout the area. They are in contact with the States to the south, so they know just how the harvest there is proceeding, how many combines are operating, how many were ready to enter Kansas, and so forth. When you have a harvest as big as the 1946 small-grain harvest, and as crucial, the program must be well organized, otherwise you will have combines piling up, areas skipped, and grain lost.

Senator KEM. You understand this is not in criticism of the combine program, but the question is would we be justified in paying the rent of the combines and the wages?

Mr. WILSON. We never have done that.

Senator KEM. What is the difference between that and the program under discussion?

Mr. WILSON. Well, I am discussing the program as now under way under Public Law 229.

Senator KEM. Yes. Now, what is the difference between paying the wages of a combine operator and the rent of the combine and the transportation of both, and paying the wages of a Mexican contract laborer's transportation, his subsistence, and his medical care?

Mr. WILSON. The Federal Government, as I understand it, has never paid the wages of any foreign workers.

Senator KEM. It was testified yesterday that there was \$150,000 for that service, that the Federal Government guaranteed the wages, and if the farmers didn't pay them the Federal Government would.

Mr. WILSON. There is always a little adjustment. I understand compliance costs two or three hundred thousand dollars, due to delays in getting shifting workers.

Senator KEM. But you understand that the Government pays it when the employer does not pay it; are we correct in that? That was the testimony yesterday.

Mr. WILSON. The Labor Board subsists the workers while being transported to and from this country and while being shifted to new areas of employment while here.

Senator KEM. No; I am talking about wages. It was testified to here yesterday that when the employer of a contract labor failed to pay him the amount specified then the Government paid him. Is or is that not correct?

Mr. WILSON. There is compliance that has to be computed, based upon the whole season's employment.

Senator KEM. Just answer that question.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Butler is right here, and I think he can give you the exact dollars.

Senator KEM. Have you any reason to believe that the testimony that was given yesterday was not correct?

Mr. WILSON. I understood it to be correct, but I am not sure that a person not connected with the program—

Senator THYE. Mr. Butler is right here, and I think Mr. Butler can answer the question, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Butler, do you care to make an answer to that?

STATEMENT OF KENNETH A. BUTLER, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR,
LABOR BRANCH, PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BUTLER. The payments that the Government makes in those cases are not payments of wages but are guaranties to the worker under the international agreement that provides that certain subsistence allowances will be made to the worker.

Senator THYE. And that is on a basis of \$33.60.

Mr. BUTLER. \$33.60 every 2 weeks under the Mexican agreement.

Senator THYE. \$33.60 every 2 weeks.

Mr. BUTLER. That is correct.

Senator KEM. And if the employer of the contract labor fails to pay him, where does he get his money?

Mr. BUTLER. He gets it from the Government and we take action against the employer of the labor to recover.

Senator THYE. And that you would recover every dollar from the employer, with the exception of the period of time that you might be moving such contract labor from Kansas City, Mo., through across into Denver, Colo., because the crop had been completed—you had harvested the crop at Kansas City and you happened to be instrumental in moving the surplus help necessary at Denver, Colo., to go into the harvest of a certain crop up there, so the Government would be involved in an expenditure of 2, 3 days while this help, surplus at it is, was being transferred from a given point to another given point because the harvest there was commencing, and the available manpower had been depleted, am I right or wrong?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, you are right. The Government is responsible for periods between assignments.

Senator KEM. I am not inquiring about that, Senator; I am inquiring about the wages of a man who works for an employer, where the employer fails to pay him for the time that he put in for the employer.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not understand you question exactly that way. Any wages for work performed for the employer are paid by the employer and not by the Government.

Senator KEM. And suppose the employer fails to carry out his contract to pay?

Mr. BUTLER. Then there would be action against the employer for the wages.

Senator KEM. I understood you to say yesterday that the amounts absorbed by the Government in such cases amounted to about \$150,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Those are for the subsistence allowances, subsistence guaranties, under the contract; yes, sir.

Senator THYE. And that subsistence guaranteed that the Government would be involved in, would be somewhat like the example I drew, where the Government was responsible for seeing that the help, that this extra surplus labor, was moved from Kansas City to Colorado or to Denver, Colo., because of the change in the harvest and the season, and the necessary manpower.

Mr. BUTLER. The period between assignments.

Senator KEM. Eliminating all of those cases, are there any cases where the Government is called upon to pay for wages which the contract employer fails to pay?

Mr. BUTLER. No; I don't believe we have ever been called upon to make such payments.

Senator ELLENDER. As a matter of fact, is not each employer bound to put up so much cash for each laborer that is employed?

Mr. BUTLER. No. That is not required by the Government.

Senator ELLENDER. That is the way it was in my section.

Mr. BUTLER. Some farm labor associations require deposits. The payments are made into the association above and beyond the wages, as a pool from which to pay expenses and to meet guarantees.

Senator ELLENDER. That is what I mean; that pool is made up by the employers who hire this labor.

Mr. BUTLER. That is right.

Senator ELLENDER. How much has the Government lost—not lost, but paid?

Mr. BUTLER. Around \$200,000 a year under guarantees provided in the international agreements.

Senator ELLENDER. How long has this program been going on now?

Mr. BUTLER. Four years.

Senator ELLENDER. This program has been going on 4 years?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Senator YOUNG. It is a remarkably low figure.

Senator THYE. And part of that expense is because we will say there are 150 men coming from Jamaica; that 150 men do not pay their own expenses coming up from Jamaica; those 150 men are brought into a given area where there is not the manpower available in that area to supply the need of that harvest or that work, and so the Federal Government has invested that much money in order to get this high curve in the production of agricultural commodities; and because of that investment, when the manpower has been made available to that area, then the producer commences to pay for the manpower after they are there.

Senator KEM. What is the expense of the service that the Senator from Minnesota refers to? Is that something like \$3,000,000?

Mr. BUTLER. I beg your pardon.

Senator KEM. The expense for bringing these laborers in.

Mr. BUTLER. The transportation expense is estimated at $3\frac{3}{4}$ million dollars for the first 6 months of 1947.

Senator KEM. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. This covers recruitment costs, the cost of bringing them in and then returning them, the transportation within this country as they move from one job to another, and the subsistence while they are in this country en route to various employment areas.

Mr. WILSON. I would like to finish my Kentucky illustration then, if the committee wishes, I will go to the farm-labor outlook for 1947.

Senator KEM. In regard to the tobacco instance, that is an instance where the tobacco has been curtailed.

Mr. WILSON. We were not involved with that; we had a job in Kentucky of harvesting 360,000 acres of tobacco with a short supply of labor.

Senator KEM. It is being done on a curtailment of acreage program.

Mr. WILSON. It is my understanding that control of tobacco acreage is in effect at the present time. But our problem is one of help-

ing the farmers get a job done when additional labor is not available to hire, even if they could afford to hire it. The approach has been one of trying to make it possible for each additional farm worker to accomplish more. In this Kentucky tobacco program we have reduced the man-labor requirement 9 days per acre.

Senator ELLENDER. Is this through mechanization?

Mr. WILSON. This was hand labor utilizing certain devices or hand tools, made by the farmers.

Senator YOUNG. I want to reiterate again that we are trying to produce sugar under ceiling prices, and I would certainly think we are obligated, at least, to try and help furnish the labor necessary to produce sugar.

Mr. WILSON. Well, our problem, of course, in the farm-labor program is to try to help farmers by supplying them labor, and by the more efficient utilization of labor so they can do the job they set out to do of planting, cultivating, and caring for crops clear through to the final harvest and preparation for market.

The questions of how much with what incentives are and determined, of course, on a higher administration level. We have to work within the framework in the farm-labor program.

If the farmers in Kentucky could have hired the labor that was saved at as low a price as 40 cents an hour, there was a saving of \$3,000,000 in labor costs that 1 year in the State of Kentucky, as a result of this program.

Senator KEM. Did any of these foreign laborers go into Kentucky?

Mr. WILSON. No; in fact Kentucky supplies labor for the States of Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio. It also supplies workers for the potato harvest in Maine.

I shall cite one more example—a situation we found existing in Texas. There are about 60,000 Latin Americans that move around Texas as the season develops. It developed that certain communities in Texas were being passed by those workers who move at their own expense.

When the Texas Extension Service investigated the reasons, they found that there were no local facilities for those workers when they arrived in a center—no place for them to stay or go to. The community was not fully appreciative of the importance of those workers to the agricultural economy of the area. So the extension service got the community leaders together, and the communities, with the stimulus of the extension service, built reception centers that served as headquarters for the Latin-Americans as they moved about the State. These are very inexpensive centers, all financed by local funds. They involve a headquarter's office, a place to camp out, laundry, bathing and toilet facilities.

That program attracted national attention, and you will find a true story of that effort in the July 27 issue of the Saturday Evening Post for this last year. Many of you may have seen it. Texas, at the present time, has 51 of those local reception centers serving those workers, built almost entirely from local funds under the stimulus of the extension service.

Let me pass on now to a consideration of the farm-labor situation in 1947. Members of my staff, in cooperation with the State extension services, have recently completed a comprehensive survey of

every single major producing area in the country, and have compiled estimates of the number of outside workers needed, that is workers from outside those respective areas, to do the production job asked for in 1947.

There are 56 major areas and 200 minor areas involved. They are all shown in color on this map. I wish you would first glance at the map, and then, if you wish, I will give figures on any individual area that you may be interested in.

The different colors are the major areas comprising a group of similar or complementary crops or areas where the same group of workers are involved.

You will notice the canning crops area here in the Central West; the sugar-beet areas shown in red in various places; the large range livestock and sheep areas; the wheat belt; and the citrus areas and vegetable areas.

We have made a careful study of all these areas drawing upon 4 years of experiences. Only the major areas have been included where a thousand or more outside workers are required in addition to all the workers who can be supplied locally or who can be moved in from neighboring areas under their own power.

Senator KEM. As of what date?

Mr. WILSON. The data have been assembled during the last 2 months. The survey is current in every respect. The outside labor needs of all areas add to about 742,000 workers. Some of the areas are complementary. I mean areas like the vegetable-fruit areas in Florida, which are handled by the same people who harvest vegetables in Maryland in July and in New York in September.

Now, if you eliminate all duplications, due to complementary areas, a net of about 600,000 workers from outside the production areas will be required to take care of the 1947 situation.

This other map will give you some idea of the movement patterns of the migratory workers—four or five big belts. We have spent a lot of effort on collecting information and in setting up information stations in order to have our fingers on the pulse of the various migratory movements. We endeavor to guide laborers to areas where they are needed, and to prevent labor from piling up in other areas. Information is supplied to employers so that they may have reliable advance information on volume of workers moving and on the progress of the work in earlier areas.

There is a large movement, of course, from Texas on up to the sugar-beet area. Here is the wheat program; here is the central program for fruit and vegetables; here is the east coast migration; here is a cotton pattern that involves the Delta, east and west Texas, clear out through Arizona; here is the very large west coast movement.

We estimate that from all those sources, based on our past experience, and allowing for some improvement this year over last year, and also making allowance for much better planning so that workers will be more fully utilized, that there will still be a shortage of about 55,000 workers to care for certain areas that, because of the character of the work or the location, cannot be cared for in the regular way by these migratory movements. We believe that it is just good business, in the light of the production goals for 1947 and the demand for food to be exported, to continue the program for another 6 months

and to provide an insurance policy for forty to sixty thousand foreign workers to insure that the 1947 farm production job is fully accomplished.

After all, those added workers are the workers required to assure the extra production in certain critical crops like sugar beets and canning crops where we might not be able to reach the goals without the additional workers.

I should like to say a word about the question of unemployment compensation and unemployed workers that has been raised here a number of times. The best information that I am able to obtain is that our civilian work force now constitutes about 58 million workers. Of that number, Mr. Goodwin reported, there are some 2 or 2½ million classed as unemployed, but not the kind of unemployed that we were accustomed to during the thirties. It has been our experience during the past year that very few of those people are either so located or so constituted that they are willing and available to do farm work.

Since 1945 we have had an arrangement with the Employment Service and the Social Security Board whereby applicants for unemployment compensation who have a background of agriculture or would be willing to take agricultural employment are referred to the extension farm labor offices, and are placed in farm jobs, if they are willing to accept such labor. A report is made back to the unemployment compensation office indicating whether the worker accepts or declines employment in agriculture.

In a few areas we have gotten some workers from that source, but for the most part, very, very few workers of that kind have accepted employment in agriculture. Workers drawing unemployment compensation usually shun the type of employment we are talking about where able-bodied, strong men are needed for hard work or to do the kind of "stoop" labor that is involved in certain of the vegetable and sugar beet crops.

Mr. Chairman, I have hastily covered a number of points. I have much collateral information should the committee desire any of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wilson, I will say that you have made a most wonderful report here on the activity of your Department, and the same can be said also of Mr. Anderson's report.

I think you have given this committee the best statement of what is going on in that branch of the agricultural service that we have ever heard here. I have never listened to one cover it so completely and satisfactorily. Mr. Wilson, you have done a wonderful job for us.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Senator. We took this on as a wartime assignment. We did not ask for the job but accepted it as a war job. We have tried to handle it in accordance with the mandate from Congress, and in a manner to satisfy and please the farmers of the Nation. We believe the record proves that a good job has been done.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Wilson, I notice we have House bill 2102 that has been passed by the House of Representatives, and S. 724. I assume that they are identical.

Mr. WILSON. No; they are not quite.

Senator YOUNG. No; they are not. I think there is one provision in the House bill that might be added to the Senate bill; that is section 2 which requires cooperation of the two services.

Senator ELLENDER. What effect would that have, Mr. Wilson?

Mr. WILSON. I have included in my statement a copy of the plan that was worked out nationally by Mr. Goodwin, representing the Employment Service, and Mr. Clague, representing the Social Security Board, and my office, to take care of this question of those applying to State unemployment compensation commissions, for unemployment compensation, who might have an agricultural background, or who might accept agricultural employment, if agricultural employment was available in the area. The plan, I think, is working quite satisfactorily in all 48 States.

But as I explained earlier, in only a few cases does it serve as a source of farm labor. In most cases the workers available are so located that the cooperative plan contributes only a trickle of farm workers.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that is all I have.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Wilson, have you made a study of both bills before us?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Overby reported yesterday that the Secretary of Agriculture has prepared a written statement on H. R. 2102 for Mr. Hope of the House committee. A similar written statement on S. 724 has, I think, been sent to Mr. Capper, expressing the Department's point of view on the respective bills.

Senator ELLENDER. Has he indicated any preference?

Mr. WILSON. The preference is for Senate bill 724 as being somewhat more workable.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

**STATEMENT OF MEREDITH C. WILSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF
EXTENSION, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Mr. WILSON. The cooperative Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and the land grant colleges and universities of the several States was assigned responsibility early in 1943 for assisting farmers to obtain the labor required for wartime agricultural production.

Under Public Law 45, approved April 29, 1943, and under Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented, for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, the Extension Service has striven at all times to carry out the farm labor program in accordance with the mandate from Congress and in a manner satisfactory to the farmers of the Nation.

Before attempting to explain how the program has been organized and conducted, I should like to stress one point with all the force at my command. That point is the over-all record of production on American farms during the past 4 years.

The facts are truly astounding. As will be noted in table 1, American farmers pushed the then all-time record production of 1942 still higher in 1943; higher still in 1944; with the years 1945 and 1946 also well above 1943. For the 4 years since the emergency farm labor program was started, total agricultural production has averaged nearly 32 percent above the prewar period, column 2.

This was done in the face of wartime shortages of fertilizers, machinery, and other production goods. It was done with a labor force dropping as much as 10 percent below the prewar number of workers, column 3, and of poorer quality.

TABLE 1.—*Agricultural production and farm employment by years, 1941-46 compared to 1935-39 average*

Year	Index of total agricultural production	Index of farm employment	Ratio-index of agricultural production to index of farm employment
1935-39 average.....	100	100	100
1941.....	113	95	119
1942.....	124	95	131
1943.....	128	94	136
1944.....	136	92	148
1945.....	132	90	147
1946.....	131	91	144

When the index of total agricultural production is related to the index of farm employment, the farm production job of the war period stands out even more clearly. In terms of the available labor supply, agricultural production for the 4 years 1943-46 average about 44 points higher than in the prewar base period, column 4.

I call attention to this almost miraculous record at the outset for fear that this most important point of all might not otherwise be set forth in its proper perspective, as we proceed to discuss operational details.

The farm-labor-supply program authorized by Public Law 229, as amended and supplemented, is in two parts:

One the domestic-labor part, handled by the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service.

Two, the foreign-labor part, including the operation of farm-labor-supply centers owned or leased by the Federal Government, administered by the Labor Branch, Production and Marketing Administration.

I speak, of course, with reference to the domestic farm-labor functions of the extension service.

The agricultural extension service of each State is responsible for the conduct of the program within that State. The county extension agent is in charge in each county, assisted by an advisory committee of farmers and other leaders, including the neighborhood system of voluntary leaders perfected at the outset of the war to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to quickly reach every single farm and farm home with food-production and other war messages.

County farm-labor assistants are employed as needed, depending upon the farm-labor load in the county. Some 2,100 of the 3,000 agricultural counties have functioning farm-labor advisory committees, and nearly 90,000 community and neighborhood leaders assist with the farm-labor program each year. More than 19,000 communities have organized programs to exchange labor and equipment.

Within each county the county agent and his farm-labor assistant with the aid of farmer committeemen determine labor requirements, develop a plan to meet those requirements, and place all labor made available to the county, including foreign labor. Every possible

effort is made to solve farm-labor problems locally by the neighborhood and community exchange of labor and machinery and by recruiting unusual sources of labor locally, such as youth, women, and townspeople.

When the labor supply within the county is insufficient the county agent certifies to the State extension office for out-of-county workers. When a State cannot meet its farm-labor requirements by transfers between counties, the State director of extension certifies to the Federal extension office for out-of-State domestic workers or to the Labor Branch, PMA, for foreign workers.

During 1943, 1944, and 1945, there was little danger of over-certification of out-of-State workers since the supply of agricultural workers was constantly becoming shorter and shorter. With the domestic labor supply slowly improving during 1946 as veterans and war industries workers returned to farms, the reverse situation has been true. Certifications for foreign workers have been kept as low as possible. There has been more shifting of foreign workers to care for emergency harvest situations. State directors of extension have been fully awake to unfavorable public reaction should foreign workers be employed on jobs returning servicemen and war workers were capable and desirous of performing.

The funds provided in section 2 of the Farm Labor Supply Act are allocated to the States on the basis of need and are handled in the same manner as regular extension funds appropriated under the Smirth-Lever and related acts. The Federal Extension Service checks the State plans of work and budget requests, reviews expenditures, coordinates the efforts of the States in facilitating movements of workers across State lines, transports interstate workers, analyzes reports and other pertinent data, and in general functions as a central clearing house for information and counsel.

DIFFERENT WAYS OF MEETING A FARM LABOR SHORTAGE

There are two ways of meeting a shortage of farm labor: One, by making additional workers available to an area, and, two, by stretching the existing supply of labor through more efficient utilization.

MAKING ADDITIONAL WORKERS AVAILABLE

During the course of a year, the Extension Service operates between 7,000 and 8,000 county and local farm labor offices where farmers make their needs for extra labor known, and through which those workers recruited locally, brought in from outside the area, domestic, and foreign are placed on farm jobs.

During 1946 needed agricultural labor was supplied approximately 500,000 farmers; 4,900,000 farm-labor placements were made, involving an estimated 2,700,000 individual workers, of whom about 1,650,000 were men, 700,000 youth, and 350,000 women.

The preceding figures include the prisoners of war made available by the War Department during the spring months, the West Indies and Mexican workers supplied by the Labor Branch, and the interstate workers transported for harvest work. The placement figures also include the experienced domestic agricultural workers and the

inexperienced youth, women, and townspeople who, as the result of all kinds of extension recruitment effort, helped get the job done.

The placement figures do not include some 500,000 persons estimated to have been influenced by informational campaigns of the Extension Service to perform farm work, but who did not clear through farm labor offices. Neither are included the migratory workers who made their own employment arrangements even though extension information helped to direct them to areas needing labor.

STRETCHING THE AVAILABLE LABOR SUPPLY

Important as have been the additional workers made available to farmers through the emergency farm labor program in getting the additional agricultural production desired during the war period, it is obvious from table 1 that increased output per farm worker, partly made possible by favorable weather, rather than increased numbers of workers, explains the tremendously larger farm production of the past 4 years.

This point is further emphasized when it is realized that, of the 2,250,000,000 man-days of labor required annually in agriculture, only 130,000,000 to 160,000,000 man-days of that labor was performed by the labor which was made available by the combined domestic and foreign-labor programs. The remaining 92 to 94 percent of the labor required for agriculture production was performed by the farmer, members of his family, and the hired help he was able to arrange for himself.

It is for that reason that the farm labor efforts of the Extension Service have always been centered in educational, informational, and service activities which make for more efficient utilization of all farm labor, including the operator's own labor. The end product sought is, of course, larger output per worker.

I shall not attempt a comprehensive review of the wide range of labor utilization activities involved in the domestic farm labor program of the Extension Service but will cite a few examples of what such activities involve.

1. At the very beginning of the farm labor program in North Carolina the Extension Service organized all the various neighborhoods of the State for the exchange of labor and equipment. A survey at the end of 1943 revealed that 66 percent of the 278,000 farms in the State had labor problems and that on 75 percent of the farms with labor problems the situation had been met by the organized program for the exchange of labor and equipment. Approximately 4,000,000 man-days of work were involved in the exchange program in that 1 State in 1 year.

2. Replacement of adult hand labor through the use of labor-saving equipment and mechanized techniques proved a lifesaver in 1944 in taking up part of the gap between labor needs and labor available in North Dakota. There were 7,045 major units of equipment, such as buck rakes, constructed and used as the result of the efforts of county agents and cooperating local leaders. This one project effected a man replacement of 18,003 workers for the harvest period.

3. During 1944 the Kentucky Experiment Station, cooperating with the Farm Work Simplification Laboratory at Purdue University de-

veloped better work methods for all operations involved in the growing, harvesting, and preparation for market of Burley tobacco.

The Extension Service put on an intensive campaign to teach farmers and farm workers the improved methods. As a result, 82,800 acres of the total of 360,000 acres of burley tobacco grown in Kentucky in 1945 were handled by better methods.

This saved a total of 745,200 man-days of labor on that one crop alone in 1 year. Had that amount of labor been available to hire, the cost to Kentucky farmers would have totaled \$3,000,000 at the low rate of 40 cents per hour.

4. Interest in farm and home labor-saving devices and methods on the part of farm people is attested to by record-breaking attendance at the labor utilization shows, caravans, trains, and so forth, staged by the various State extension services. The average attendance at 406 such demonstration meetings has been 1,067 persons.

5. In Texas many agricultural communities were being avoided by the 60,000 Latin-American workers who move about the State as the crop season develops. Analysis of the situation revealed the causes, absence of facilities for use of the migrants and lack of community appreciation of the contribution such workers made to the agricultural economy of the area.

What the Texas Extension Service did about it attracted national attention. A true story of it appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* on July 27, 1946. As of this date, 51 reception centers for migrant workers are in operation in Texas provided by Texas communities under Extension Service stimulus.

6. Marked improvement has been brought about in the migratory movement of workers along the Atlantic seaboard from Florida to New York and return. Through a series of information stations at strategic locations, reliable current information is supplied workers regarding weather and crop conditions and work opportunities in the various specialized areas.

Employers are acquainted regarding the size and progress of the movement and are afforded an opportunity to contact crews moving northward that do not already have employment contracts. Similar information programs are in process of establishment for the 7 far West States and the 14 Central States.

7. A cooperative arrangement is in effect between the extension services of Texas and the Lake States and the sugar-beet industry for facilitating the movement of Latin-Americans to sugar beet and vegetable areas, insuring their fullest possible employment and return to Texas following a satisfactory employment season.

8. The orderly harvest of the record-breaking wheat and small grain crops of 1946 was handled expeditiously through the cooperative wheat harvest program operated by the extension services of the Plains States.

9. About 1,000,000 farmers each year are assisted by the extension farm labor program with problems of labor utilization; 100,000 farmers, labor foremen, and supervisors of youth labor are given organized instruction in how to train inexperienced labor; 300,000 individual workers are given training in how to perform farm jobs or how to do them better.

Surprising as it may seem, the available facts would indicate that agriculture has not kept pace with nonagricultural industry during recent years from the standpoint of production per worker. Compared to an index of 100 for the 1910-14 base period, the index of production per employee in agriculture had reached 151 by 1940. For industry the corresponding index was 180. During the years 1941 to 1946 the index of production per employee was from 15 to 34 points lower in agriculture than in industry—table 2.

TABLE 2.—*Production per worker—Agricultural and industrial—United States*

Year	Index of production per employee		Year	Index of production per employee	
	Agriculture	Industry		Agriculture	Industry
1910-14.....	100	100	1943.....	182	215
1940.....	151	180	1944.....	198	218
1941.....	158	192	1945.....	194	217
1942.....	174	204	1946 (tentative).....	190	205

Source: BAE agricultural outlook charts, 1947.

There are many other extension activities which I shall not attempt to describe such as transportation of workers within States and between States to meet emergency harvesttime situations; the organization of farm labor cooperatives; assistance to farmers in improving farm labor housing; loan of tents, cots, blankets, and feeding equipment; the operation of farm labor camps; collection and analysis of facts relating to labor requirements, labor sources, farm safety, and so forth.

The large part played by increased output per man in maintaining farm production in face of shortages of labor and other production goods more than justifies the 65 to 70 percent of the domestic farm labor program centered in efficient utilization of labor and collateral matters. It is doubtful if more than 30 to 35 percent of the domestic program is directly concerned with what is usually thought of as the recruitment and placement of labor.

There are two other aspects of the domestic farm labor program which should be mentioned briefly before summarizing the farm labor supply outlook for 1947.

STATE EXTENSION SERVICE CONTRACTS WITH USES

Under the provisions of Public Law 229, as amended and supplemented, the State extension service may contract with other agencies to perform farm labor functions. During 1946, 10 States entered into 11 contracts, totaling \$375,657, which called for certain limited recruitment and placement services to be performed by USES offices. Two of the 10 States, New York and Idaho, have discontinued contracting with employment service agencies in 1947. Three States have extended their contracts. Three States are planning to negotiate new contracts. The plans of the remaining two States have not been reported—table 3.

TABLE 3.—*Extension Service contracts with U. S. Employment Service, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946*

State	Amount of contract				
	1943	1944	1945	1946	Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947
Alabama.....	\$20,000.00				
Arkansas.....	46,558.68	\$16,477.37	\$19,083.36	\$17,506.32	No report.
Arkansas (Memphis).....	8,826.68	7,765.00	10,000.00	7,500.00	Do.
Idaho.....	51,696.00	34,000.00	37,700.00	29,650.00	Terminated.
Illinois.....	76,203.00				
Kansas.....	67,297.16				
Kentucky.....	5,500.00	8,000.00	9,600.00	3,600.00	Will probably be extended.
Maine.....	1,365.56				
Maryland.....	9,026.68				
Massachusetts.....	2,100.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	Extended to June 30.
Michigan.....	27,000.00				
Minnesota.....	21,187.83	42,100.00	15,000.00	18,000.00	Will probably be extended.
Mississippi (Memphis).....	5,000.00	3,000.00	4,000.00	3,500.00	No report.
Missouri.....	25,299.77				
Montana.....	38,478.58				
Nebraska.....	10,629.00				
Nevada.....	4,581.05				
New York.....	95,702.87	253,583.00	256,118.20	198,978.42	Terminated.
North Carolina.....	56,938.00	61,326.00	61,431.00	56,330.00	Extended to June 30.
North Dakota.....	21,018.80	26,399.44	36,285.52	31,092.39	Being negotiated.
Ohio.....	17,035.00	2,500.00			
Oregon.....	67,274.00				
South Dakota.....	19,185.00				
Tennessee.....	35,549.70				
Tennessee (Memphis).....	5,000.00	3,300.00	5,000.00	4,500.00	No report.
Texas.....	100,409.68				
Utah.....	15,300.00				
Virginia.....	25,000.00				
Washington.....	82,127.34				
Wyoming.....	15,196.00				
Hawaii.....		10,370.83	10,300.00		
Total.....	976,486.38	473,821.64	469,518.08	375,657.13	
Number of States with con- tracts.....	28	12	11	10	

CLAIMANTS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND VETERANS' ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS

Since September 1945 a cooperative plan has been in operation in all States whereby applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' benefits, having agricultural background or otherwise qualified to perform agricultural labor are referred to the extension service farm labor office for placement in agricultural openings. The plan which was developed by the Federal agencies involved seems to be working satisfactorily in all States. In some areas the plan yields a reasonable number of agricultural workers. In other areas only a trickle of workers are obtained from this source. The cooperative plan referred to appears at the end of this statement.

1947 FARM LABOR SITUATION

Beginning with April 1946, for the first time since before the war, the number of persons employed in agriculture showed a slight improvement over the corresponding period 1 year earlier.

That trend continued throughout 1946. In consequence the fall harvest was completed without the 125,000 prisoners of war available in 1945, and with 30,000 fewer foreign workers than were utilized the previous year. Some improvements in the domestic farm labor supply is anticipated during 1947.

An important point to consider in attempting to forecast the adequacy of the agricultural labor supply during the coming season is the probable competition between agriculture and industry for labor. Civilian employment is at or near a record level and wages continue to be more attractive in nonagricultural than in agricultural employment—table 4.

TABLE 4.—*Farm wage rates and hourly earnings of factory workers, United States*

	Index numbers			Index numbers	
	Farm wage rates	Factory hourly earnings		Farm wage rates	Factory hourly earnings
Year:			Year:		
1910 to 1914.....	100	100	1943.....	264	454
1940.....	126	312	1944.....	315	481
1941.....	154	344	1945.....	350	483
1942.....	201	403	1946 (tentative).....	380	505

Source: BAE Agricultural Outlook Charts, 1947.

Members of the Federal extension staff in cooperation with State extension service farm labor personnel are just completing a survey of the farm labor need and supply situation in each major producing area. After proper deductions are made for complementary work, it is their judgment that a net of 600,000 workers from outside the major production areas will be required to handle the agricultural production being requested of American farmers in 1946.

Those 600,000 workers are in addition to the labor that can be recruited locally. A systematic analysis of the workers likely to participate in the various migrant movements indicates that we shall be still short some 55,000 workers in spite of improved plans for making the fullest possible use of such workers.

Labor supplies will be least adequate in those areas where sugar beets and certain vegetable crops require large amounts of stoop labor and men to do heavy work. Unfortunately, many of those areas most likely to be in short supply of workers are at great distance from possible sources of outside labor. A highly flexible task force of 40,000 to 60,000 male foreign workers would seem at this time to be a necessary insurance policy.

The 1947 problem is not one of prewar production with the pre-war farm work force, but instead a job of maintaining agricultural production at a level 30 percent higher than during the 1935-39 period.

(The plan is as follows:)

PLAN FOR COOPERATIVE ACTION INVOLVING STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AGENCIES,
UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, AND THE EXTENSION SERVICE FARM LABOR
PROGRAM FOR HANDLING DISPLACED WAR WORKERS AND VETERANS

THE PROBLEM

An important aspect of reconversion following the ending of the war is the getting of workers who have been making war materials and the returning veterans back into useful peacetime jobs. Unemployed workers who are claimants

for unemployment compensation benefits or veterans' readjustment allowances are expected to be available for work as a condition for receiving payments. Displaced war workers and veterans should have an opportunity to accept, in accordance with their qualifications and past experience, both agricultural and nonagricultural jobs that may be available.

The United States Employment Service registers unemployed workers and veterans who are claimants for unemployment compensation benefits or readjustment allowances in accordance with arrangements made with State employment security agencies. Placement opportunities for such workers in agriculture are not adequately known to the United States Employment Service. This is because Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, as supplemented, makes the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture and the State agricultural colleges rather than the United States Employment Service responsible for the placement of agricultural workers.

The Extension Service farm labor program is, of course, anxious to replace the unusual workers who withdraw from the labor force—aged men, women, and youth, and the imported foreign workers and the prisoners of war—all of whom have been a part of the farm work force during the war emergency, with experienced agricultural workers released from war plants and the armed services, just as rapidly as such workers become available.

SOLUTION

A suitable arrangement needs to be made whereby displaced war workers and veterans with agricultural experience will be channeled from the local United States Employment Service office to the county farm labor office of the Extension Service for placement when agricultural jobs exist.

RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION

Because of variations in State unemployment compensation laws, as well as differences in farm labor requirements of States, it will be desirable that the cooperative plan of action for a given State be that which seems most practical to the State directors of the employment security agency, the United States Employment Service, and the Agricultural Extension Service. It is desirable that, if satisfactory arrangements do not already exist, they be completed as soon as possible. To facilitate this, the State war manpower director is being requested to contact immediately the State director of extension and the State administrator of the employment security agency, and arrange for a conference of representatives of the three agencies to consider the matter.

The following operational plan is offered as a general guide:

1. The local USES office responsible for the registration of displaced workers and veterans will contact the county extension farm labor office or suboffice from time to time to learn of job openings for experienced agricultural workers. Displaced workers and veterans possessing suitable qualifications will then be referred by the USES office to the extension farm labor office for placement. Where the extension farm labor office is in need of large numbers of additional workers to fill orders for seasonal and harvest hands, that information should be relayed to the USES office to ascertain if unemployed nonagricultural workers might be available for farm employment.

2. In the cases of such persons referred by the USES office, it will be necessary for the extension farm labor office to report back on the referral card or otherwise to the USES office acceptance or refusal to accept a specific farm job since this information may have a direct bearing upon clearance of benefit claims.

3. In handling referrals of applicants for unemployment compensation and veterans' benefits, it is important that they receive the same consideration for job openings in agriculture as other workers with similar qualifications seeking agricultural employment.

4. Nothing in the cooperative arrangement entered into at the State level should imply a transfer of responsibility for handling unemployment compensation and veterans' allowance to the Extension Service farm labor program. Neither should there be any suggestion that the State extension

service farm labor activities are in any way being supervised by the War Manpower Commission or the employment security agency.

Cleared by:

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
*Director, United States Employment Service,
War Manpower Commission.*

MEREDITH C. WILSON,
*Deputy Director of Extension, Farm Labor Program,
United States Department of Agriculture.*

EWAN CLAGLE,
*Director, Bureau of Employment Security,
Social Security Board.*

August 28, 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Butler.

MR. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss briefly certain parts of the Senate bill, and to discuss some changes in language that were incorporated in the Department's report on the bill.

In the first instance, Director Anderson this morning mentioned the significance of the permissive feature of S. 724 in providing an active program on the supply of farm labor to December 31, to be followed by liquidation within 90 days thereafter.

I believe that it is important that this provision be continued in the bill in order to assure a supply of labor even to December, where necessary, and to be able to return the workers to their native lands within the period provided for liquidation.

Now, we have asked that the language on line 10, page 1——

Senator ELLENDER. Of what bill?

MR. BUTLER. S. 724. That there be added to Senate 724 after the sentence ending—

and thereafter shall be liquidated within 90 days—

the following language—

and the provisions of said act are hereby continued during such 90 days solely for the purpose of said liquidation.

Now, the reason for this request is that, assuming that there are workers in the country on January 1 that haven't been repatriated, due to the late employment season, we would want authority to provide medical care, housing, and subsistence for them until they could be moved out of the country.

Senator ELLENDER. Would that not be inclusive when you speak of liquidation? That is understood.

MR. BUTLER. Our language, we hope, would be clarifying. Now, if it is the intent of the Congress that it would be thus interpreted, it would be sufficient for us. Our request is solely for the purpose of clarifying the fact that we could carry on certain of our activities pending the return of these workers.

Senator ELLENDER. I should think that would be included in the word "liquidate."

MR. BUTLER. If it is the opinion of the committee and of the Senate and Congress that "liquidate" would be so interpreted I think it would be satisfactory.

Now, if there are workers in the country, pending their return home after December 31, we would need the privilege of housing those workers for temporary periods in the labor camps or farm-labor supply centers that we are now operating.

Under the language of S. 724, the camps would have to be turned over for liquidation not later than December 31, 1947. We would like to substitute the date of March 31, 1948, in order that the entire program would run concurrently and carry the same liquidation date.

Now, as was brought out earlier today, it would certainly be our intention and our plan of operation to turn over camps to liquidating agencies as soon as the workers are out or the camps no longer needed, and to remove workers when they are no longer needed—as soon as the jobs are completed in certain parts of the country, and they can be released—and to dispose of our property as rapidly as possible. But there may be contingencies that will make it necessary to carry over activities into January solely for purposes of liquidation, and we would like to have certain camps available for those purposes.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I think it was brought out here that by the middle of December all harvesting of any crops in the United States would be completed. I think the testimony that I have heard bore that out. Now, if that is the case, you are taking an awfully long time in evacuating foreign help or concentrated help if you ask for this to continue up until March. That is 105 days from the middle of December, and I just cannot follow you.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not believe, Senator, that we would be using the camps as long as March. I cannot conceive of such a situation; but I do know what the transportation problem is. The maximum number that we can move into Mexico, using 3 sets of equipment south of the border, is around 17,000 workers a month.

Senator THYE. I would not anticipate that you, in the field of special employment, would have to import many workers in the year of 1947. It would be more on a basis of a concentration of available help here and there throughout the United States. I realize that you have to make that work known, where the work is, and concentrate the help where the help is needed, but I would highly question whether you would have to import many men from many sections of a foreign country, and I cannot conceive that it is necessary for you to find yourself operating those camps from the middle of December that you have testified or your men have testified—to carry them through from that time on to March 1; that is, 105 days. I just cannot conceive of that length of time.

Mr. BUTLER. Senator, we do not think we need that time. Certainly, January 31 should see the foreign workers out of the country. Last fall we had some 22,000 workers in sugar beet harvest; half of them were still there December 15.

Senator ELLENDER. Is that foreign labor?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, sir. And it is extremely difficult to get equipment to handle these large moves, and we do feel that we will need some time into January to accomplish complete repatriations.

Senator THYE. Again, I have to bring this one question up, and that is, If you know that the foreign help has to be out of these camps and out of this country and back into their country at a certain specified time, you will exercise more caution as to where you move the foreign help. You will be moving the foreign help back into their respective countries, and concentrating the help of the United States that will be much easier to disperse when you finished your final acreage, and that is the reason I would much rather see this, instead

of being 90 days, it would be 60 days, and you would have to complete your entire process of liquidation within 60 day rather than 105 days, after the last known harvest. We are trying to save money here, and I am very liberal in all of my views all the way through here because I know of the need in the country, but I will not be liberal when it comes to liquidating in 105 days from the last known harvest.

Mr. BUTLER. The crops are harvested in California and Arizona all through 1947. I do not know when the 1947 harvest ceases in Arizona, California, Florida, or Louisiana. How late we should carry the workers in those States, I do not know. Would those States be entitled to workers up to December 31? Would we have reason for removing them from California, for instance, before the harvest is completed?

Senator THYE. But again, Mr. Butler, we must not lose sight of this: That your first obligation as an agency operating under the Federal Government is to give employment to your own United States people, and if in the event you have foreign people in here—and that is the greatest problem that you have of maintaining these camps, for the housing of these foreign people—that in the event you should be so careless in your administration that you left unemployed citizens of the United States somewhere in the United States, and still continue to employ foreign people, then you would be wrong in your administration, and I think this is an absolute safeguard, that you would make an examination as to who your employees are, where they are from, how long it would take you to disperse them and get them back to their respective communities than if you knew that you had 105 days from November after the last-known day for harvesting, and for that reason I would be more inclined to say that you are very extreme in asking to go 90 days. You would be better off to try to liquidate it in the month of January.

Mr. BUTLER. The matter of the definition of "liquidation" itself, Senator, is open to question. That is, just what constitutes liquidation. Now, property will have to be inventoried, turned over to some disposal agency, surveyed by them before acceptance. We have the matter of pay rolls from growers submitting final payments for workers who are already out of the country. In Michigan they do not settle up on the sugar-beet harvest until after the beets are weighed in at the processing plant, and final checks come along in January and February for transmittal to workers. Somebody has got to handle such things. We have carriers' bills for transportation within Mexico that are very slow in coming in.

Senator ELLENDER. What I think Senator Thye had in mind was the upkeep of these camps.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought we were to keep these camps operating as long as needed in the program.

Senator THYE. Get out of it completely.

Senator ELLENDER. You mean by December 31.

Senator THYE. You see, Senator Ellender, the testimony shows that the last known acre was harvested in the middle of December, and the harvest in the Northwest has been quite well completed by the middle of November, specifically even in your sugar beets, you see.

Mr. BUTLER. But it is not in California and certain other States.

Senator THYE. He is shrinking out of the picture in some areas that the consideration for surplus help is getting down to a minimum, and

that would be in the last known district of harvest, which would be in the Southwest. Well, he is shrinking. If he were exercising a thought that he has got to be out of business by a certain time, the shrinking process would be first to get rid of the foreigners, second to get rid of those who have been transported the greatest distance, where we have the responsibility of concentration in camps, and then get down to the specific and get down to saying that the last we are going to have here is going to be the man here who is local to either Arizona or Texas or New Mexico or California.

Senator ELLENDER. But still and all that liquidation could have to be carried on until the next year.

Senator THYE. Yes; there would be some. But you see, he would have all the opportunity of liquidating in the Middle West, liquidating in the extreme Northeast, and the liquidation in the central part, and he would be just concentrating his last efforts down here in the extreme corner of the Southwest part of the Nation in the last harvest, so that his liquidation should not commence January 1 or December 31; it should commence as they finish the harvest in a given area, wherever your harvest comes to an end, so that you would be getting down there to where you would be tapering off to almost a minimum.

Mr. BUTLER. It is the last groups that I am concerned about, Senator. How we are going to handle those in the final movements out of the country in order to meet the deadline? It is not all of the camps about which I am concerned, but it is the last few in the localities where the remaining workers are that we feel we may have difficulty in providing for without access to some camps.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

We have got about a dozen more witnesses who have expressed a desire to be heard. Our question is whether we want to go on this afternoon or wait until Monday morning.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to go on with all the witnesses; I think we know about the merits of the program.

Senator ELLENDER. Are there any present here with statements to submit?

Senator YOUNG. Unless they are in opposition to the bill.

Senator ELLENDER. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that those present who have statements come forward and submit them.

I now desire, Mr. Chairman, to present in behalf of Clarence J. Bourg, representing the American Sugar Cane League and the Farmers' and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association a statement prepared by him, and ask that it be placed in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be so placed in the record.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE J. BOURG, AMERICAN SUGAR-CANE LEAGUE, AND FARMERS AND MANUFACTURERS BEET SUGAR ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. BOURG. My name is Clarence J. Bourg, and I represent the American Sugarcane League and the Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association. The former is an association whose members are growers and processors of sugarcane in Louisiana, and the latter is an association of the growers and processors of sugar beets in the States of Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

The requirements for laborers in the sugar industry are as critical and as uncertain in 1947 as they were in 1946. Contracting of beet acreage is now going on and the growers are asking for assurances that they will have labor to thin and block as well as to harvest the crop. Unless those assurances are made positive by the extension of the farm-labor program, there will definitely be great reductions in the plantings of sugar-beet seed.

Louisiana has planted a large acreage in sugarcane, representing an increase over 1946. The harvesting of the sugarcane crop requires considerable hand labor and in this period of critical sugar shortage, it is of the greatest importance that these growers have assurance that there will be available sufficient labor to save the crop.

The Louisiana sugar industry has made considerable progress toward mechanization and more than half of the crop is expected to be harvested with mechanical equipment. With the greater production of farm machinery and tractors, we anticipate that conditions should be greatly improved in 1948, but there still remains the necessity for the recruitment and placement of interstate and foreign labor to complete the 1947 harvest.

In order to bring about a maximum production of sugar, the Secretary of Agriculture has established a goal of 1,069,000 acreage for sugar beets. This total figure has been broken down to goals for each State, so that Michigan has a goal of 140,000; Ohio, 35,000; Wisconsin, 17,000; Illinois, 3,000; and Indiana, 500; making a total of 195,500 for the eastern beet area.

Using the measure of labor needs, according to the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, 1 laborer is needed for each 10 acres. This would mean a total of 19,550 for the acre. Taking the case of Michigan as an example, the acreage goal is 149,000, which will require 14,000 workers.

Estimates have been set up for each State as to the needs for foreign workers at the time of harvest and 3,500 has been set as the figure for foreign workers to be used in Michigan during October, the peak month, leaving 10,500 workers to be recruited locally and from domestic sources.

There were 8,253 workers recruited from domestic sources in 1946 for work in Michigan which took care of 112,000 acres in sugar beets as well as other crops such as pickles, cherries, apples, and other fruits and vegetables.

If Michigan is to respond to the appeal for a maximum crop of sugar to satisfy the consumption requirements of the United States, then foreign workers are necessary to the full extent of the 3,500 estimated in addition to the local workers and those recruited from other States. The needs for the eastern beet area will be in proportion.

To whatever extent these foreign workers are made available to our farmers, the problems of recruiting farm workers from other States will be reduced. If there should be no foreign workers recruited, the competition for domestic farm workers will be greatly increased and made much more difficult.

In like manner, sugar production in the United States would be correspondingly reduced and the consumers of the Nation would become the chief sufferers since relief for them depends very greatly upon the United States mainland production.

Gradually the planting and harvesting of sugar beets is becoming mechanized. Great progress is being made, but the manufacture of these machines has been very slow. Again, it becomes a question of how soon mechanical planters and harvesters will take the place of hand labor.

The time is perhaps near at hand, but the prospects in 1947 are for only a partial realization of the mechanization that is expected in 1948 and in future years.

Progress is being made, but we have to ask for assistance and encouragement on the labor supply to see us through the transition period toward full mechanization. That is the only way the sugar bowls of America can be kept reasonably filled.

STATEMENT OF JOHN H. DAVIS, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. DAVIS. We urge that the program for the recruitment and transportation of domestic and imported farm labor be extended as provided in S. 724.

Since the harvesting season for some winter crops is not yet complete, and the planting and preparation season for 1947 crops is at hand, it is necessary that authority and appropriations for continuing the present farm-labor program be completed as early as possible. The present authority expires June 30, 1947, in the middle of the farm-work year.

The background of the labor situation on farms in the United States is briefly as follows:

1. During the war period approximately 5,000,000 of the effective working manpower left the farms. These went into war industries and the armed services. They are not yet returning to rural areas as hired field workers. Based on previous industry history, war accelerates the movement of people to industrial and urban areas, and only extreme depression reverses the net movement.

2. The domestic farm-labor supply remaining on the farms was supplemented in 1946 by about 4,000,000 placements of boys and girls and others recruited from urban areas under the farm-labor program; by elderly farm men and women recalled from relative inactivity; and by an increase in the hours worked, which reached a maximum average per day in seasonal farm operations of almost 13 hours for family workers.

3. In addition to the domestic farm labor, on January 1, 1947, approximately 25,000 workers imported from nearby countries and islands of the Western Hemisphere were employed on our farms. A total of about 65,000 foreign workers were employed on farms during 1946.

4. With the postwar let-down, domestic workers recruited in urban areas have steadily withdrawn from farm work.

5. During the war the well-established channels of migrant farm labor, and the areas from which they originated, were tapped, and workers normally employed on farms were drawn into industry by public and private employment agencies.

Likewise, the established recruitment of farm labor by private contractors and employers was discontinued in the face of war industry competition and public employment agency activities. There is little prospect that these normal channels of farm-labor supply will be restored as they previously existed.

6. While some displaced industrial workers are returning to areas from which they originated, workers who originally came from rural areas now largely are classified as skilled industrial workers, and many of them utilize their savings and unemployment benefits until suitable industrial jobs for workers of their skills are available.

7. Except those who are returning as farm owner-operators or farm renter-operators, only 34,000 veterans accepted farm work through the farm-labor program during the first 11 months of 1946. Many of those veterans who might be expected to return to rural areas have become skilled technicians through training in the armed services and upon discharge evince a preference for industrial employment.

8. After World War I, it was well toward the third year after hostilities ceased before the tight farm-labor situation was eased by industrial employment decline.

9. Farm wages are high, and in many critical farm-labor shortage areas, are on a level or above comparable industrial wages. In many nonindustrial areas, farm wages are well above minimum going wage rates, and in many other areas, farm wages approximately are equal to or exceed minimum wage rates now under consideration by the Congress.

The farm wage rates are highest around industrial areas where shortage is most critical. Many workers in industrial areas came recently from rural areas. Wage rates paid for farm work are not usually the deterring factor in obtaining farm help in areas having displaced war workers.

10. There is a heavy turn-over in seasonal farm labor throughout all seasons of the year, and continuous recruiting placement, and movement of farm workers has always been necessary.

11. Most public and private employment agencies are trained and preoccupied in the recruitment of urban workers, and the activities of these agencies have tended to see labor drawn away from rural areas.

Under future conditions, except those conditions of long continued mass unemployment in industry and services, the continuation of an employment service devoted to organizing farmers for handling farm labor and training workers in efficient methods are expected to be important in supplying needed labor on farms.

A very large proportion of all farm labor must be skilled in picking and packing, dairy operations, operating farm machinery, handling livestock, or in other specialized operations.

Research and training workers and employers for efficient use of farm labor has developed into an important aspect of agricultural labor programs.

It is anticipated that there will be adjustment in production in some commodities due to changing domestic and export needs. However, the total volume of farm production on the basis of the present outlook will remain large, particularly of those products which require help with a high degree of specialization, such as has been provided under this law.

Based on the information available to us from official and private sources, we respectfully urge that provisions be made for continuing the present farm-labor recruitment, importation, and placement service with appropriations and authority adequate for the full production year of 1947.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM H. TOLBERT, NATIONAL FARM LABOR CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Tolbert. My name is William Tolbert. I am speaking for the National Farm Labor Conference which has been meeting in Washington March 5 and 6, 1947. This meeting is the outgrowth of a series of meetings which began in June 1946.

These meetings were national in character, but intervening regional, State, and local meetings were held to develop the facts and suggestions for farmer employers throughout the Nation. The plan was to consider the needs and develop a program which would be beneficial to all agriculture.

As you gentlemen know, the Federal farm-labor program was established during the war, and has been extended as the needs required; this program has been very effective in meeting the agricultural needs throughout the Nation during this emergency period.

The cooperative Extension Service and the Labor Branch have worked together in coordinating the over-all requirements with the available domestic labor and supplementing where necessary with foreign workers. We well appreciate that such a program cannot be continued indefinitely. However, it is our firm belief that the emergency in farm labor will not be ended at least for the balance of this year.

We have been constantly reminded the war is over, the shooting war is over, but the battle for world-wide peace has just begun. The principal ammunition for this battle is food. During the war the American farmer was called upon to produce food in tremendous quantities and in the main these requests were fulfilled and exceeded the fondest hopes of our world leaders.

The demand for material for war has dropped to almost nothing, whereas the over-all demand for food is as much as during the war and in many crops greater, such as the marked increase requested for production of domestic sugar.

We appear in favor of the recent bill, S. 724, introduced by your honorable chairman, to extend this program to December 31, 1947, with a 90-day liquidation period.

We request your assistance and favorable support on this bill for the following reasons:

The first is that the recruitment and contracting for labor, whether domestic or foreign, has to be well in advance of actual employment, making it necessary that these agencies know as quickly as possible what will be expected of them. An example is the need of the sugar-beet growers in the intermountain States who will require considerable labor by May 5. Before signing contracts to plant sugar-beet acreage the grower must be assured that there will be available labor to harvest the crop which he will plant and cultivate this spring. Farmers in other sections of the country face a similar problem.

A liquidation period beyond the end of the year is very essential in order to complete the harvest season in the northern areas of the country. In many of these areas the workers will still be urgently needed throughout the month of November, and in many cases throughout the month of December.

If these workers must all be returned home by December 31, it would mean that the responsible Government agency would have to commence repatriation in many areas as early as October; this, then, demonstrates that many farmers would be deprived of the services of these workers during a very critical period. Since they are already in this country, it would seem advisable to let them remain until the job is finished this year.

We wish to go on record as favoring section 2 of S. 724 with reference to the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of Labor taking the necessary steps to assure maximum cooperation between the Extension Service and the State public employment agencies in carrying out their duties.

All farmers are interested in utilizing every available local worker who is willing to do farm work. We are also interested in eliminating from the unemployment compensation rolls any persons who are qualified for agricultural employment. This should be developed so that there is maximum clearance in every State.

We would like to mention that in many areas farmers have to compete with industry for their labor needs; also in many important agricultural areas there are and will be various postwar projects under way, such as highway construction, building dams for flood control, and so forth, which will tend to draw labor which might otherwise be available for agriculture.

The significance of extending this farm-labor program, from the standpoint of the small grower, is that he will be able to obtain laborers as a result of the recruitment and placement by the Federal and State agencies.

The Government-operated camps have been of material help to the small user of labor, as his requirements are small and usually for short periods. It would be too costly for him to maintain his own camp, whereas the larger users of farm labor have found definite advantages in operating their own camps.

The farm-labor shortage continues to be acute for 1947 crops. The average farmer would prefer to use domestic labor when available. As a matter of fact, foreign labor is more expensive and their employment involves a farmer with a great many regulations.

The contract with foreign governments requires rigid standards of housing and guaranties of steady employment to the extent that when the foreign workers are not employed, they have to be paid a subsistence.

In many instances, farmers maintain and operate their own housing and feeding program, which is not fully covered by the maximum amount of board permitted to be deducted from these workers' pay.

There are many other valuable services conducted under the present farm-labor program, other than the recruitment and placement of domestic and foreign workers.

We have in mind specifically the labor utilization program conducted by the Extension Service, which has been of invaluable as-

sistance to many agricultural employers. They have been instructed in better ways of doing a specific job and in methods of getting the maximum service out of their labor.

They have also done a great deal in training workers, and in helping farmers to train their labor in better methods of doing the job. A great deal of assistance has also been given in developing better housing for farm workers.

These and other educational services have been and will continue to be, very beneficial to the farmer.

**STATEMENT OF FRED BAILEY, THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Mr. Chairman, my name is Fred Bailey, representing the National Grange. I have no prepared statement, but I merely want to say for the record that during the past 4 years we have found the program operated very efficiently, very economically. We believe that we cannot meet the goals this year, 11,000,000 acres over last year, and the dire need for food, without some sort of a continuation of this program through this year.

We do not regard it as a subsidy in any way, any more than the Weather Bureau is a subsidy to us. It is a service to the Nation and the world to produce the food that we are going to need so vitally during the next year.

And for those reasons, the National Grange urges very strongly that this program be continued for the remainder of this year and into a reasonable liquidation period in the next year.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you like to file a statement so that it will appear in the proceedings?

Mr. BAILEY. I think this is sufficient, Senator. If you wish me to file a statement I will file a formal statement.

The CHAIRMAN. We will leave you to handle it any way you want to.

Mr. BAILEY. All right, thank you.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIS H. TOBLER, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU
FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.**

Mr. TOBLER. I am Willis H. Tobler, of the American Farm Bureau Federation. We will submit a statement in favor of the bill, too, Senator.

(It is as follows:)

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,

*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN CAPPER: On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, I wish to strongly support enactment of the Capper bill, S. 724, to continue the farm labor supply program for an additional 6 months, until December 31, 1947, with a provision for a 3-month liquidation period beyond that date. Unless this legislation is enacted, the present program must be ended by June 3, 1947.

Farmers are still having difficulty in getting an adequate supply of workers in many areas of the country. It is urgently necessary that this legislation be passed as soon as possible in order that farmers may be assured before planting their crops that they can get sufficient labor to harvest their crops next fall.

The main part of the program is the recruiting and placement of domestic labor, which is handled through the Agricultural Extension Service in the re-

spective States. They have done a magnificent job. Last year the Extension Service made over 4,000,000 placements of farm workers. This shows the vital importance of this service to farmers.

There are still serious shortages of agricultural workers in a number of areas of the country which cannot be met from domestic sources, and it will be necessary to continue to use a limited number of foreign workers during 1947. As shown by the testimony in the hearings, however, the use of foreign workers has been greatly reduced below wartime demands and is rapidly diminished. We do not favor the use of a single foreign worker who is not needed, but we are convinced that it will be necessary to utilize a limited supply of foreign workers in 1947.

We wish to respectfully urge that the committee report favorably either the Capper bill, S. 724, or amend H. R. 2102 in line with the provisions of S. 724. S. 724 differs from H. R. 2102 in two respects:

(1) S. 724 includes a provision for a 3-month liquidation period beyond December 31, 1947. This is particularly important in connection with the utilization of foreign workers in order to permit the liquidation of foreign workers who may be needed up to December 31, 1947, and permit their return after that date.

(2) The Capper bill omits the provision in section 2 (a) of H. R. 2102, which would permit the United States Employment Service and the State employment services to maintain a farm placement service, duplicating this work which is now being done so efficiently, economically, and satisfactorily by the Agricultural Extension Service. We are strongly opposed to this provision in the House bill.

At this time, when every effort should be made for economy in government, there is no justification for permitting the Employment Service to build up a duplicate staff of employees at Federal, State, and county levels to place farm workers.

Furthermore, farmers throughout the Nation are strongly opposed to turning over such functions to the Federal and State employment services. When farm placement activities were handled by these agencies before World War II, farmers were very much dissatisfied with the manner in which these functions were handled. These agencies are not closely in touch with farmers or familiar with their problems nor are they equipped to handle the placement of agricultural workers successfully. On the other hand, the Extension Service has offices already available in every agricultural county, equipped with a trained, experienced staff of persons familiar with the farmers' problems and in daily contact with farm people. The Extension Service can handle this problem in the most economical, effective, and satisfactory manner.

The charge has been made by some representatives of the State employment service that they cannot refer persons on relief to farm employment. If this is true, it is the fault of the regulations governing the payment of unemployment relief and not the fault of the Extension Service. There is nothing to prevent the employment service from referring such persons to the extension service for placement in agricultural work. In order to make sure that authority and direction is given by Congress for this purpose, section 2 of the Capper bill and section 2 (b) of H. R. 2102 require full cooperation between these agencies in order to avoid any such situation.

I will appreciate it if you will include this statement in the record of the hearings.

Sincerely yours,

W. R. OGG,
Director, Washington Office.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT C. GOODWIN, DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the committee and commenting upon the Senate bill 724 which you have under consideration.

This measure provides for the continuation of the Emergency Farm Labor Supply Program operated by the Department of Agriculture until the end of the calendar year. The production goals for the forthcoming crop season have been established with a view not only to our domestic needs, but also the world food situation.

To meet these goals, it is going to be necessary to mobilize effectively our domestic labor resources. The bill provides for the continuation of the existing administrative machinery to December 31, 1947, rather than crop off the program on June 30 in the middle of the crop year.

This is in my opinion necessary because any disruption in the program of meeting the labor requirements for agriculture activities for the forthcoming crop season is bound to have serious implications in meeting production goals.

Section 2 of the bill provides that—

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, 58 Stat. 295.

Shortly before V-J-day, the War Manpower Commission in which the USES was then located entered into arrangements with the Department of Agriculture which would assure that job seekers registering at local employment offices, who have previous experience in, or qualifications for, agricultural work would be referred to the county agency for farm placement.

In this connection, arrangements were made for reporting to the appropriate State Unemployment Compensation agency those instances in which a qualified job seeker claiming benefits refused to accept farm employment. This arrangement was decided upon to achieve similar objectives sought in this bill. I am sorry to say, however, that in actual practice these arrangements have not worked so satisfactorily as have been desired.

There have been difficulties resulting from the different physical locations of the two organizations dealing with the same individuals. There have been differences in procedures and record keeping that impaired the flow of information to the unemployment-compensation agencies. There have been misunderstandings because the State unemployment-compensation programs are complicated and technical in character and not well understood by agricultural groups since agricultural workers as such are excluded from the coverage of the State laws. As a result, some qualified farm workers who probably should have accepted suitable farm employment have remained upon the unemployment-compensation rolls.

I believe it desirable that section 2 of this bill be retained and certainly the agencies concerned should bend every effort to make it as effective as possible. The arrangement, however, has inherent weaknesses and too much should not be expected of it. In my judgment, this bill would be improved if it contained section 2 (a) of H. R. 2102, which states:

The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm-placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933.

This provision is especially desirable since it would permit the United States Employment Service and the State public employment services to undertake farm-placement activities during the remaining period in which the emergency farm-labor-supply program is continued in the Department of Agriculture. In this way, it would be possible to accomplish an orderly transition from the emergency farm-labor-supply program to the full resumption of farm-placement activities by the United States Employment Service and State employment services as provided under the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933.

Upon the completion of the liquidation of the emergency farm-labor-supply program on December 31 of this year, the Employment Service will be in a position to resume its full responsibilities to meet farm-labor requirements through the existing facilities of public employment offices.

With the resumption of the farm-placement activities in the Nation-wide system of public employment offices, there will be, in my opinion, a number of distinct advantages. Among these are—

1. Recruitment from a common labor force. Farm and nonfarm industries drawing upon the same source of labor will be served by a single agency and the interval of unemployment between farm and nonfarm employment can be minimized. As you know, seasonal fluctuations occur in the number of agricultural workers and each season farm operators in many areas are dependent upon the supply of domestic industrial workers to meet harvesting-labor needs.

An important segment of agricultural labor normally moves from one geographical area to another in accordance with seasonal crop requirements. The facilities of the public employment offices are particularly well adapted to guide and direct the flow of migratory labor to the areas of need. In many cases agricultural labor requirements are met through the utilization of the labor resources in the local community and the surrounding areas.

It has been the established operating practice of the public employment offices each crop year to bring together all of the community resources represented in youth available from the schools, housewives, and other workers in the local labor reserve to meet the seasonal needs.

2. Use of common recruitment facilities. The Nation-wide system of public employment offices makes available the facilities of 1,800 full-time offices and 2,700 part-time itinerant points to meet agricultural labor needs. Eighty-seven percent of these offices are located in or adjacent to agricultural districts. The organization which already exists in the public employment service will minimize the additional costs which will arise in connection with the full resumption of farm-placement activities.

The existence of trained personnel to assist in recruitment of workers and in obtaining farm-labor information and in maintaining necessary community relations will not only provide for effective mobilization of agricultural labor resources, but will permit such mobilization to take place with maximum economy and efficiency.

3. Conservation of unemployment-compensation funds. With the full resumption of farm-placement activities by the public employment offices, it will be possible to effect more efficient administrative arrangements with State unemployment-compensation agencies.

This is especially important with respect to experienced agricultural workers who claim unemployment-compensation benefits on the basis

of nonagricultural employment when such workers refuse to accept suitable farm jobs.

In view of these considerations, I wish to repeat that I think this is a desirable measure.

(The prepared tables are as follows:)

Insured unemployment¹ in the continental United States during week ended Jan. 25, 1947, by State

[In thousands]

State	Insured unemployment					
	Total		Under State unemployment insurance programs		Under veterans unemployment allowance programs ²	
	Week ended Jan. 25, 1947	Percent-age change from Dec. 28, 1946	Week ended Jan. 25, 1947	Percent-age change from Dec. 28, 1946	Week ended Jan. 25, 1947	Percent-age change from Dec. 28, 1946
Total.....	2, 279. 2	+16. 5	1, 122. 0	+18. 1	1, 157. 2	+15. 0
Alabama.....	34. 9	+19. 9	11. 9	+21. 4	23. 1	+19. 1
Arizona.....	8. 7	+50. 0	3. 3	+50. 0	5. 4	+50. 0
Arkansas.....	30. 5	+11. 7	19. 7	+17. 6	19. 8	+9. 4
California.....	258. 7	+30. 5	173. 0	+32. 7	85. 7	+25. 4
Colorado.....	10. 2	+36. 0	2. 5	+25. 0	7. 7	+40. 0
Connecticut.....	17. 4	+22. 5	10. 0	+16. 3	7. 3	+32. 7
Delaware.....	5. 2	+33. 3	2. 7	+50. 0	2. 5	+19. 0
District of Columbia.....	10. 8	+40. 3	4. 4	+33. 3	6. 4	+45. 5
Florida.....	30. 8	+24. 2	14. 3	+43. 0	16. 4	+10. 8
Georgia.....	30. 8	+15. 4	10. 9	+31. 3	19. 8	+7. 6
Idaho.....	7. 3	+82. 5	3. 5	+84. 2	3. 8	+81. 0
Illinois.....	117. 2	+14. 9	69. 2	+12. 5	48. 1	+18. 8
Indiana.....	35. 7	+9. 5	14. 8	+14. 7	21. 0	+6. 6
Iowa.....	18. 3	+38. 6	6. 7	+48. 9	11. 6	+33. 3
Kansas.....	21. 2	+21. 8	9. 0	+18. 4	12. 2	+24. 5
Kentucky.....	43. 7	+16. 3	10. 3	+12. 0	33. 4	+22. 3
Louisiana.....	43. 3	+17. 7	15. 7	+30. 8	27. 6	+11. 3
Maine.....	18. 0	+34. 3	8. 1	+30. 6	9. 8	+34. 2
Maryland.....	27. 3	+30. 6	13. 2	+37. 5	14. 1	+24. 8
Massachusetts.....	105. 7	+16. 3	55. 3	+13. 8	50. 5	+19. 4
Michigan.....	97. 1	+18. 6	52. 7	+27. 9	44. 4	+9. 1
Minnesota.....	36. 1	+37. 8	11. 9	+48. 8	24. 3	+33. 5
Mississippi.....	16. 7	+28. 5	6. 3	+37. 0	10. 4	+23. 8
Missouri.....	74. 7	+22. 3	34. 8	+25. 6	39. 9	+19. 1
Montana.....	8. 0	+37. 9	3. 5	+59. 1	4. 6	+27. 8
Nebraska.....	8. 3	+48. 2	3. 5	+52. 2	4. 8	+45. 5
Nevada.....	2. 2	+37. 5	1. 3	+44. 4	. 9	+28. 6
New Hampshire.....	5. 8	+41. 5	2. 7	+42. 1	3. 2	+39. 1
New Jersey.....	100. 4	+5. 6	57. 2	+5. 3	43. 2	+5. 9
New Mexico.....	6. 5	+30. 0	1. 2	+20. 0	5. 3	+32. 5
New York.....	322. 8	+15. 1	193. 1	+6. 6	129. 6	+30. 5
North Carolina.....	25. 6	+31. 3	11. 5	+47. 4	14. 1	+21. 6
North Dakota.....	5. 3	+43. 2	1. 4	+40. 0	3. 9	+39. 3
Ohio.....	77. 8	+9. 0	37. 2	+10. 1	40. 6	+7. 7
Oklahoma.....	35. 0	+9. 7	14. 7	+14. 8	20. 3	+6. 3
Oregon.....	31. 1	+32. 9	18. 9	+29. 5	12. 2	+38. 6
Pennsylvania.....	204. 6	+14. 4	77. 2	+18. 4	127. 4	+12. 1
Rhode Island.....	16. 6	+20. 3	7. 3	+25. 9	9. 2	+15. 0
South Carolina.....	20. 7	+7. 3	5. 3	+10. 4	15. 4	+6. 2
South Dakota.....	3. 5	+66. 7	. 9	+80. 0	2. 6	+73. 3
Tennessee.....	60. 0	+12. 4	24. 5	+55. 1	35. 5	+5. 6
Texas.....	79. 2	+17. 3	18. 9	+65. 8	60. 4	+7. 7
Utah.....	9. 1	+44. 4	4. 3	+53. 6	4. 8	+37. 1
Vermont.....	2. 5	+19. 0	1. 1	+10. 0	1. 4	+27. 3
Virginia.....	22. 4	+18. 5	7. 3	+35. 2	15. 1	+11. 9
Washington.....	70. 4	+14. 4	50. 6	+20. 2	19. 9	+5. 9
West Virginia.....	38. 8	+12. 8	14. 6	+18. 7	24. 2	+9. 5
Wisconsin.....	20. 1	+10. 4	8. 0	+23. 1	12. 0	+2. 6
Wyoming.....	1. 9	+58. 3	. 7	+75. 0	1. 2	+71. 4

¹ Includes partial and part-total unemployment.

² Includes claims under illness and disability proviso; these amount to less than 1 percent of the total.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Administration; Reports and Analysis Division U. S. Employment Service, U. S. Department of Labor, Mar. 7, 1947.

*Insured unemployment¹ in the continental United States in last week of month,
January 1946–January 1947*

[In thousands]

Month and year	Total	Under State unemployment insurance pro- grams	Under veterans' unemployment allowance pro- gram ²
1946:			
January	3,083	1,892	1,191
February	3,559	1,907	1,652
March	3,410	1,628	1,782
April	3,246	1,509	1,737
May	3,215	1,487	1,728
June	2,881	1,242	1,639
July	2,849	1,176	1,673
August	2,493	939	1,554
September	2,116	911	1,205
October	1,861	891	970
November	1,841	916	925
December	1,956	950	1,006
1947:			
January	2,279	1,122	1,157

¹ Includes insured partial and part-total unemployment.

² Includes individuals filing claims under disability proviso; such claims amount to less than 1 percent of total.

Source: Bureau of Employment Security, Social Security Administration: Reports and Analysis Division, U. S. Employment Service, U. S. Department of Labor, Mar. 7, 1947.

Mr. GOODWIN. Senator Kem, I believe it was, asked for some information yesterday on unemployment compensation which I did not have readily available. I have those two tables which I think will cover the information that he wanted, and I have filed them with my prepared statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is there anyone else who has a statement?

Mr. GARDNER. My name is Morris B. Gardner, and I am assistant director of the Shade Tobacco Growers Agricultural Association of Hartford, Conn. I have a statement to submit and also some testimony from other interests, agricultural interests in the Northeast, which I would like to submit in favor of this bill.

STATEMENT OF M. B. GARDNER, SHADE TOBACCO GROWERS AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION, INC., HARTFORD, CONN.

Mr. GARDNER. We desire to be on record as favoring S. 724, introduced by Mr. Capper, to provide for a 6 months' extension of farm labor supply program, with a liquidation period of 90 days, and for other purposes.

The necessity for extending this program arises from the fact that while the war is over, the employment emergency on our farms continues. At the peak harvest season we employ between 18,000 and 20,000 agricultural workers. Every possible way is used to recruit as much of this labor locally as possible.

However, with the high industrial employment in this area, highway construction and other postwar projects, we cannot see where our entire labor need can be supplied locally.

In order to protect our needs, we have placed an order for an additional 1,000 Jamaicans and 1,100 out-of-State youth to be supplied under this program. We have 850 Jamaicans in our employ now who have been working in the warehouses all winter.

In addition to these, we will attempt to recruit 1,200 to 1,500 southern colored workers for the South; many of these will be from colleges and high schools. This cannot be accomplished without necessary clearance through the Extension Service farm labor supervisors, due to laws in Southern States prohibiting such recruitment of agricultural workers.

Shade tobacco is our chief crop, and is urgently needed to meet the cigar manufacturers' requirements for wrapper tobacco. Many farms are diversified agricultural enterprises, growing large acreages of food crops needed throughout the world.

During the fall months, many of our Jamaicans are leased to other potato, vegetable, and fruit growers to take care of their harvest needs. The employment record of Jamaicans in our State has averaged 98 percent or better since this program started.

We appreciate that these workers were brought into this country at considerable expense to the Government. It has also cost us a great deal to provide and maintain housing and other facilities, as we house most of our own labor.

In many instances, they have not been the best workers, but until local labor is willing to return to the farm, it will be impossible to maintain our present production and also to produce the 8-percent increase in acreage requested by the Department of Agriculture for 1947. We have always operated on the basis that as soon as local labor is available, Jamaicans would be released. This same procedure will be continued this year.

Our crop is one which does not lend itself to mechanization. It requires about two people per acre to harvest and prepare the crop for further processing in the warehouse. There is no indication that any of this labor could be satisfactorily replaced by machinery.

We honestly feel that the continuation of this program is urgently needed by the small grower as well as others. We believe that the placement records of the Extension Service will indicate this, since many workers are placed several times during a season.

The few remaining Government-operated camps are needed to house such workers. These farmers are not in a position to provide their own housing and other facilities. By discontinuing the program during the present agricultural labor shortage, the smaller farmer would be proportionately hurt a great deal more than the larger operator.

There are other phases of this program which we feel should be continued. The Extension Service has carried on a training program for both farmers and employees which has been an invaluable service to both through their labor utilization projects they have shown farmers how they can better utilize their labor and better methods of doing the job. This usually works out that a better job is accomplished, the workers benefit through the savings obtained, and work is more appealing.

The first is that the recruitment and contracting for labor, whether domestic or foreign, has to be well in advance of actual employment. In many areas additional foreign workers will be needed in April and May, so that the Labor Branch will soon have to begin the necessary negotiations.

The repatriation of the workers requires a period of liquidation extending 3 months or more after the farm employment is termi-

nated. It would be difficult to liquidate the program and still allow for completion of the purposes for which the program was established.

Thus, workers would have to be moved from this area before the harvest season is completed, which then extends well into December. This is usually when the labor shortage is most critical.

We wish to thank you for this and past consideration of our farm labor problems.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

DOVER, DEL., March 6, 1947.

MR. M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GARDNER: In response to your request over the telephone last evening, I am sending you certain information about the present local labor supply and the outlook for needs and supply of farm labor during the approaching crop season.

Insofar as the anticipated needs during 1947 are concerned, I believe the Delaware farm goals for 1947 listed below show clearly that our labor needs will be at least equal if not greater than a year ago.

103 acres wheat for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

102 acres corn for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

107 acres rye for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

140 acres barley for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

120 acres oats for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

120 acres soybeans for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

102 acres hay for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

120 acres sweetpotatoes for each 100 acres grown in 1946.

An increased food production goal is being asked for in the case of nearly every farm commodity. At present, the indications are that the 1947 fruit crop will be the heaviest in years.

Owing to insufficient local labor and indications that too few migrants will be coming north early in the season, present plans of the Extension Service here in Delaware call for the opening and operation of the Wessex Farm Labor Camp with foreign workers, beginning about April 20. This camp will be cooperatively operated between the Wessex Cooperative Farm Labor Association, Delaware Agricultural Extension Service and the Labor Branch of PMA, USDA, and all parties are in agreement that should and when sufficient local labor or migratory workers become available in that area, the foreigners will be transferred to another section of the State or removed from the State, depending on needs and supply at such a time.

Delaware's tentative allotment of foreigners has been set at 500, in comparison with approximately 700 last year and slightly over 1,000 during 1945. Even if this reduced allotment can be granted, considerable increased numbers of local and migratory workers will have to be found if we are to equal last year's production levels, let alone reach the 1947 food-production goals.

Here in Delaware at the present time I understand in some sections numerous people are unemployed owing to the closing of poultry processing plants, a temporary condition brought about by a depressed market resulting from farm selling prices lower than production costs. During the past 4 or 5 days the market has advanced about 6 cents and this temporary condition will most likely change. At the most, this temporary supply is not the answer to our farm labor needs here in Delaware during the coming season.

As further evidence that every possible effort has and is being made here in our State to utilize all local workers who will accept farm employment, a cooperative operational plan between our extension service, unemployment compensation commission, and United States Employment Service has been in effect for about 3 years; was revised on October 2, 1946, and became effective on November 16, 1946, or when USES was transferred back to the unemployment compensation commission. This plan is still operative and county farm labor assistants interview UCC claimants and refer them to farm work.

You might be interested also in the fact that the chairman and executive director of UCC has advised Delaware Senators and Congressmen that he is not,

nor is the commission, participating in any movement to have the farm labor program transferred to USES.

Finally, let me say from purely a personal experience that local people willing to accept farm employment must be very scarce; in fact, rather nonexistent because for the past 8 weeks, I've been trying to find a farm hand to assist with my fruit farm to be employed on a year-round basis, and without success. In fact, today I'm in need of four men to assist with pruning and cleaning brush and could give them work on every clear day for the next 8 weeks.

If additional information is desired, please feel free to call on me.

Yours truly,

W. H. RICHTER,

Representative, Cooperative Farm Labor Associations in Delaware.

P. S. The attached few samples of news clippings are somewhat typical of ads appearing in our local and State papers.

[The Peninsula Broiler Journal, Selbyville, Del., Monday, March 3, 1947]

HELP WANTED: Man, experienced broiler grower to take care of 18,000, one house with carrier. Must have good references. Up-to-date living quarters. Good salary and modern equipment. Delaware Poultry Farm, Hartly, Del. Phone Dover 3047.

[Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del., Wednesday, March 5, 1947]

6 PERCENT JOB GAIN REPORTED HERE—CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CHECK SAYS 57,474 WERE EMPLOYED IN THIS AREA AS OF FEBRUARY 15

An employment gain of 6 percent was shown in the Wilmington area as of February 15, compared with the same date in 1946, according to the quarterly employment report announced yesterday by the chamber of commerce.

A total of 57,474 workers were employed in this industrial area in the 615 plants included in the report. This compared with 53,910 on the same date of 1946, or an increase of 6.2 percent. The employment peak on February 15, 1945, was higher, however, with 61,021, but this total was only a few hundred under the all-time high during the war years.

The trend from January 15, 1947, to February 15, the report also shows, was 1,302 additions and 997 separations, or a net gain of 305 in the month's span.

[The Sussex Countian, Georgetown, Del., Thursday, February 20, 1947]

HELP WANTED

MALE OR FEMALE—WHITE OR COLORED

SUSSEX POULTRY CO.

MILFORD, DEL.

Call, Write or Phone 750-751

MANCHESTER, GA., March 6, 1947.

LAMONTE GRAW,

Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Acute labor shortage still exists in this peach district. Used 555 foreign workers last season. Have applied through extension service for over 700 for this season. There is great need for foreign labor program to be extended.

JOHN J. BROWN,

Chairman of Peach Growers Committee.

MONSEY, N. Y., March 6, 1947.

Hon. N. B. GARDNER,

Hay Adams Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

The lack of farm labor in this part of New York State is very serious; we respectfully urge the passage of bill S. 724.

H. H. BROWN.

MOUNTAIN CITY, TENN., March 5, 1947.

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel:

Extension farm labor bill S. 724 vital to our vegetables. Farmers crop should amount to approximately \$2,000,000 this year.

R. J. HOWARD,
Cashier Farmers State Bank.

LOCKPORT, N. Y., March 6, 1947.

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel:

We strongly urge passage of bill S. 724 extending life of Public Law 229 for 6 months with 3 months liquidation period.

JOHN A. HALL,
*Secretary, New York State Association Labor Cooperatives,
and President Niagara County Producers and Processors Cooperative.*

KINGSTON, N. Y., March 6, 1947.

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

Our two growers associations in Ulster County have ordered 250 workers. Indication are we cannot recruit them locally. Growers prefer local help but they believe foreign workers are needed for regular help this season.

ALBERT KURDT,
County Agricultural Agent.

WILDWOOD, N. J., March 6, 1947.

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel, Washington, D. C.:

I respectfully urge passage of bill authorizing extension of foreign farm labor to end 1947 with additional 90 days for liquidation. I raise 180 acres of beans. I cannot secure local labor. Cannot house southern migrant families. I employed three Jamaicans in 1946.

ALLAN McCLAIN.

CHASKA, MINN., March 6, 1947.

MAX B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel:

Growers of sugar beets in southern Minnesota consider it absolutely necessary that Public Law No. 229 be extended so that Mexican national field workers may be imported to take care of this years field work. Seven hundred and sixty-four Mexican nationals used in this area for thinning. Last year 876 nationals used for harvest. These workers harvested sugar beets valued at 2¼ million dollars for which no local or domestic labor was available. We feel the situation with respect to available labor is changed very little this season, and if the beet crop is to be properly cared for Mexican nationals are desperately needed.

V. J. KLINKHAMMER.

TRENTON, N. J., March 6, 1947.

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay-Adams Hotel:

New Jersey Farm Bureau emphasizes AFBBF stand opposing ending Extension Service supervision farm labor on December 31, 1947, without at least 60-day liquidation. We oppose permitting State employment services to duplicate Farm Placement Service.

H. W. VOORHEES,
President, New Jersey Farm Bureau.

SALISBURY, MD., *March 6, 1947.*

M. B. GARDNER,
Hay Adams Hotel:

Wicomico County farmers employed Bahamians and Jamaicans laborers in 1944 a total of 34,966 man-days; in 1945, a total of 39,670 man-days; and in 1946, a total of 46,389 man-days. While there has been some return of industrial workers as well as veterans to this community, very few of them have reached the farm except veteran farm owners or sons of farm owners. Unless farm-labor programs continue we are positive that the food crop planted and harvested in the county this year will be much less than in the last few years, even though migrant workers reaching this should be double that of recent years.

THE WICOMICO COUNTY TRUCK GROWERS
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION, INC.
H. WILSON LOWE, *President.*

EAST GRANDFORKS, MINN., *March 6, 1947.*

MAX B. GARDNER,
Hay Adams Hotel:

Members of Red River Valley Beet Growers Association harvested 35,500 acres of sugar beets last year and intend to harvest at least 37,500 acres this year. Supply of labor in 1946 was so short great difficulty was had in getting crop in even though we used Mexican national labor. In view of increased acreage in 1947, our thought is that it is imperative Public Law 229 be extended to enable us to secure again imported labor to supplement the domestic labor supply.

RED RIVER BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION.
WALTER ROSS, *President.*

STATEMENT OF RALPH M. BELYEA, WASHINGTON STATE FARM LABOR COMMITTEE,
SEATTLE, WASH.

THE WASHINGTON STATE FARM LABOR COMMITTEE,
Seattle, Wash., March 6, 1947.

HON. ARTHUR CAPPER,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: On behalf of the Washington State Farm Labor Committee I wish to submit to the honorable members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this statement in support of S. 724, Eightieth Congress, first session, providing for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes.

The Washington State Farm Labor Committee is composed of representatives of all segments, large or small, of agriculture in the State of Washington. It was organized early this year to meet the threatened emergency in harvesting crops during 1947. It existed informally throughout the war.

The farm-labor program authorized by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), as amended, made it possible for the farmers and growers in the United States to produce the food crops which were essential to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion and to meet the tremendous demand for food immediately following cessation of active hostilities. Today the demand here and abroad continues at unprecedented levels. To avert unnecessary hunger and hardship in the United States and foreign countries American farmers and growers must produce huge quantities of food. They cannot do so, however, unless they are assured that they will have the necessary labor when it is needed.

The domestic farm-labor supply in the State of Washington is clearly inadequate. Washington farmers and growers must have the help of foreign agricultural workers. Without such workers, they cannot plant, cultivate, harvest, or process food crops in the quantities required.

During 1946, farmers and growers in the State of Washington imported about 2,800 foreign farm workers and in addition employed about 600 prisoners of war until the middle of that year. In 1947, they must have 3,000 foreign

workers to supplement the supply of domestic agricultural labor. Without them, production of food crops in the State will be sharply curtailed.

The demand for foreign workers in the State of Washington begins in the second or third week of March when the asparagus crop is ready for harvesting, and continues until the middle of December. These workers are required for beet sugar in May, peas and strawberries in June, cherries in the latter part of June and in July, hops, peaches, and apricots in August, and apples and pears thereafter.

The demand for foreign workers reaches its first peak in June, when 1,500 of them must be on hand. The second and higher peak is attained at the end of September and the beginning of October, when an additional 1,500 are required, and it is maintained through the first week in November. Although the demand begins to taper off early in November, the need for foreign labor does not actually cease until the middle of December.

The period from early September to early November is most important to the large fruit industry of the State of Washington. It is the time when many crops ripen and must be picked. The apple industry in particular must have large numbers of workers to harvest the apples before the frost. The required number of workers can be secured only if agricultural labor is imported.

The Washington State Farm Labor Committee supports S. 724, not only because it would continue the farm-labor program until the end of 1947, but also because it would provide a period of 90 days thereafter for liquidation of the program. Without this period, the effectiveness of the program will be greatly diminished. As pointed out above, the demand for foreign farm laborers in the State of Washington does not cease until the middle of December. Transportation facilities are severely limited, as this honorable committee well knows, and it requires from 2 to 3 months to repatriate the foreign farm workers who come to the State of Washington. If the farm-labor program must be liquidated by December 31, 1947, it will be necessary to commence repatriation early in October when, as shown above, the demand for and need of the foreign agricultural workers are at their height.

In view of the foregoing, the Washington State Farm Labor Committee urges enactment of S. 724 in its present form.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WASHINGTON STATE FARM LABOR COMMITTEE,
By RALPH M. BELYEA.

Senator YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, there is one witness who wants to appear in opposition to the bill, and, although I will not find myself in agreement with him, I think possibly he should be heard, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone here in opposition to this bill? (There was no response.)

Senator YOUNG. We have been accused of inaction in Congress, and here is one place where legislation can be speeded up. I do not see way any action on this bill should be held up any longer.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have another session of the committee at which time we will hear the person in opposition to this bill; is that satisfactory?

Senator YOUNG. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nothing else, we will adjourn to meet Wednesday morning at 10:15.

(Whereupon, at 12:55 p. m., an adjournment was taken to 10:15 a. m., Wednesday, March 12, 1947.)

FARM-LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1947

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in room 324 Senate Office Building, Senator Arthur Capper (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Capper (chairman), Thomas of Oklahoma, Bushfield, Aiken, Ellender, Pepper, Young, Hoey, Kem, Thye, and Wilson.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

We are here to take up S. 724, which is a bill to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program, and for other purposes.

I understand we have a witness to appear before us, Mrs. Sasuly.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH SASULY, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, FOOD, TOBACCO, AGRICULTURAL AND ALLIED WORKERS OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. SASULY. My name is Elizabeth Sasuly. I am the Washington representative of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers Union, an affiliate of the CIO.

The CHAIRMAN. How long has that organization been going?

Mrs. SASULY. It has been in existence since 1937. I am appearing on behalf of my own union and also on behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Where is the national headquarters of that organization?

Mrs. SASULY. The national headquarters of our organization is in Philadelphia. I am the Washington representative of the union.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been here some time, have you?

Mrs. SASULY. Yes; I have been here for about 5 years now.

Senator KEM. It is an agricultural workers union?

Mrs. SASULY. It is the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural and Allied Workers of America, CIO.

Senator KEM. How many members does that organization have?

Mrs. SASULY. We have about 102,000 members under contract, under union contract.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the organization growing any?

Mrs. SASULY. Yes; we are very proud of the fact that in the past 2 years we have virtually doubled our membership.

Senator BUSHFIELD. It is connected with the CIO organization, is it?

Mrs. SASULY. Yes; it is, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you are ready, we will be glad to hear from you.

Mrs. SASULY. I want to make a few remarks and summarize briefly from a prepared statement, which I am offering here for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. By the way, what State are you from?

Mrs. SASULY. Illinois, but I have more recently been a resident of the State of California, originally I came from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. Your organization is not made up of farm representatives to any extent, is it?

Mrs. SASULY. Our organization is made up primarily of industrial workers in food processing plants and in tobacco processing plants, cigars, cigarettes, and so forth.

However, we also have in our organization agricultural workers, that is, wage workers in agriculture, not farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. What part of the country are they from?

Mrs. SASULY. Well, we do not have very many agricultural workers who are actually organized in the trade union sense of the word in our organization at present. That is, we do not have contracts for them.

We have some in Illinois on the farms of the California Packing Corp., in De Kalb and Rochelle, Ill. We have some in Florida. We have some in California.

While our organization in the past organized very extensively among agricultural workers, during the past few years, our main organization has been among industrial food processing workers and tobacco processing workers.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to hear from you.

Mrs. SASULY. Thank you, Senator.

I should like to point out to begin with that our organization supported this program during the war. We supported in spite of the fact that we felt there had been no adequate efforts made to mobilize domestic farm labor within the country for war-food production. Even at the peak of the very real farm-labor shortages, which did exist in some areas during the war, there were still many agricultural workers, particularly in certain regions of the South, who were making very low wages. There was a surplus supply of workers who, if there had been an over-all program, could have been brought into the areas where there were real shortages.

We felt there should have been such an over-all mobilization program. However, there was no such program, and therefore, as an emergency measure we did support the importation of foreign workers. There were some pretty flagrant instances of importation under conditions where the workers were actually not needed.

For example, in Florida in 1942, I believe it was, several thousand Bahaman workers were brought in at a time our people right there on the spot in Florida were available for work. There were literally thousands of agricultural workers within the State itself who were available for work. However, in spite of that, we did support most aspects of the program during the war; although we did oppose the importation of Bahamans I have just described but we cannot see any excuse for continuing the program at the present time as a peacetime measure.

We think interests who are working for a continuation of it, the people who are crying loudest about farm-labor shortages, are doing it not so much because there is a real need for the workers as for the old reasons which over a period of many decades have brought about the importation of foreign workers, primarily Mexican workers, into California and Arizona, and those reasons are very simple. They have been trying to create a surplus pool of labor so as to depress wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Your understanding is we do not need any foreign workers here?

Mrs. SASULY. That is right. I would like to give you some figures, if I may, about some of the most important agricultural areas, indicating what reserve supplies of domestic labor there are which could be called upon in some of the areas from which demands are coming for foreign labor.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Was there not quite a large squabble between the two unions in California last year?

Mrs. SASULY. You are referring to the cannery situation?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mrs. SASULY. There was a National Labor Relations Board election. The results of that election were not adequately enforced. Consequently, there was no resolution of the desire of the California cannery workers to vote for a union which they wanted.

Senator BUSHFIELD. I remember that Senator Knowland of California made a speech on the floor one day in which he discussed the question of cannery workers and possibly agricultural workers in California were not able to take care of their crops because of that fight between the two unions.

Mrs. SASULY. Senator, that is a long story. I would be glad to tell it if the committee is interested in it, but the facts are not exactly like that. It needs some explanation.

No agricultural workers were involved. What happened was the teamsters union in collusion with the employers in California and in violation of an order of the National Labor Relations Board, pulled the trucks, and consequently there was some, though not very much, actual loss of food.

There was a collusive boycott between the teamsters union and the companies. The cannery workers continued to go to work. The boycott was to secure the signing of an illegal contract between the industry and the teamsters union. That is the story very briefly of what happened in California. As it happens, there were no agricultural workers involved in this. It had to do with the canning industry in northern California.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you been actively interested in this work?

Mrs. SASULY. Since 1938, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. You are an old-timer?

Mrs. SASULY. I guess I am getting to be one. We can see no excuse for the continuation of an importation program with Government sanctions, which is going to do just exactly what the previous illegal importation of foreign workers did.

Senator BUSHFIELD. She is speaking now, Senator Pepper, of the State of Florida.

Senator PEPPER. Yes, thank you. I am sorry I was late in arriving. I am not going to be able to stay too long, but I want to hear as much of this as I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the importation of foreign labor going on to any extent?

Mrs. SASULY. I believe you have before you the figures as to how many foreign workers are in the country right now. Of course, this is not the peak agricultural season. I have them here, if you would care to have them. These are the figures of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. As of February 1, 1947, there was a total on that date of 23,681.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Is that in all the States?

Mrs. SASULY. I believe so; yes. That includes Mexicans, Jamaicans, Bahamans, and so forth.

Senator PEPPER. I notice in your prepared statement that you made some difference between the House bill and the Senate bill. Is there any limited extension of this thing that you think might possibly be given, properly be given, or enacted and then let the program terminate unless Congress should enact new legislation to authorize, for example?

Mrs. SASULY. Well, Senator, we do not feel there is any real need for extension at all.

However, I do think as between the House bill, which extends the program for a period of 6 months, with liquidation within the 6-month period, and the Senate bill which extends the program for 6 months, with an additional 90 days for liquidation, that the House bill is preferable because, very frankly, I think that the interests that are working for the extension of this program have in mind, although they say, "No; we are not worried about 1948, we just want to get through the 1947 crop season," I think that they have in mind coming back to Congress in the winter and spring of next year with exactly the same story.

I know predictions are very dangerous, but I would be willing to predict in January or February of next year, these people will be back in here asking for the same kind of extension for the next crop season. Therefore, I think it would be very advisable to terminate the program as of December 1947, if there is to be any extension. I realize I am the only witness in opposition to it. I am speaking in complete opposition to the program, but if the committee votes an extension, I certainly do not think it should be for more than a 6-month period.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you give us the names of these organizations who are for this kind of a program?

Mrs. SASULY. I know the grower-shippers in Imperial Valley, Calif., are very anxious to get Mexican labor, and I am most anxious to tell the committee very specifically why they want to get Mexican labor to Imperial Valley in California.

It affects my union most directly. We have contracts in the Imperial Valley covering all of the vegetable packing-shed workers. There are some 2,500 such workers during various seasons of the year in Imperial Valley. These contracts are held by one of our local unions, local 78, which has 15,000 members in the States of California and Arizona. They are the migratory packing-shed workers who

move between the Salinas and Watsonville Valleys, Imperial Valley, the San Joaquin Valley, and the Salt River Valley of Arizona, following in many cases a regular annual cycle.

In Imperial Valley, this is what the grower-shippers have done this year, in spite of the fact they have union contracts covering all the workers in their packing sheds and there have been improved and amicable relations between the shippers and the union now over a period of years, although in the past there was a great deal of strife, in spite of that fact, the shippers have put mobile packing sheds on wheels into the fields.

The workers who ordinarily do the stoop labor on lettuce, carrots, and broccoli in the field have been brought into these mobile packing sheds, and the Mexican nationals have been used to do the stoop labor. For every one of those displacements and replacements, one of our workers under contract in a regular, established packing shed loses his job.

That is what went on this winter in the Imperial Valley.

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the Chair to have a vote on this legislation today?

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the committee to say.

Senator KEM. Mr. Chairman, I have a very interesting telegram here which I would like to bring to the attention of the committee. It recommends that there be some further investigation on this matter. Before a decision is reached or a vote taken today, I would like to be heard.

Senator PEPPER. It could go over to another meeting of the committee, if it could, I myself would like it very much. We could then have a vote at the next time.

The CHAIRMAN. I have an idea that there is considerable testimony to be taken here on this.

Senator PEPPER. I have another pressing Florida meeting that is taking me downtown, and I am interested in it. If you do have a vote today, Mr. Chairman, I want to be recorded as voting for 6 months' extension of this thing and a complete liquidation of the program at the end of that time, unless Congress reenacts it.

Senator AIKEN. It was pointed out the other day, Senator Pepper, that it would be advisable for the committee to take action pretty soon because of the wheat growers getting ready to plant. It was testified by the director of the Colorado Extension Service that they wanted to know how much labor they were going to have before doing their planting.

Senator PEPPER. Yes. I am sure all of us agree that it is rather inconsistent to protect the products of our agricultural industry against foreign competition, and at the same time allow our own people to be competing with foreign workers who have a lower cost of living plan than our American agricultural workers.

Senator AIKEN. Inasmuch as the bill has already passed the House, probably a few days' further delay would not be disastrous to anybody.

Senator PEPPER. I wanted to make this regret. I regret to have to leave, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mrs. SASULY. We have heard a great deal of discussion about economy.

Senator ELLENDER. You said your union members lost their jobs because some of these mobile units were used in the field. Why was that? Is there a new method that they have adopted?

Mrs. SASULY. What was done in using these mobile units in the field, Senator Ellender, was that workers who ordinarily did the stoop labor were put into these mobile units as packing-shed workers.

Senator ELLENDER. Are these stoop workers organized?

Mrs. SASULY. No; they are not. This was used as a means of weakening the union. Field workers were brought into these mobile packing sheds, and their places were taken in the fields by Mexican nationals.

The only reason the shippers were able to do this was that they knew they had the Mexican nations there to put in the field and could work out a program of displacing the union workers.

Senator ELLENDER. When did they start these mobile units?

Mrs. SASULY. This winter.

Senator ELLENDER. How differently are they operated from the regular packing sheds?

Mrs. SASULY. They are very similar, except that the operation is on wheels, and it can be taken from field to field. It is very similar to the regular packing shed.

Senator ELLENDER. Has your union attempted to send its workers out to operate these mobile machines?

Mrs. SASULY. It has been done in such a way that it has been impossible for our union to do so. It has been in a kind of backhanded manner that this has been done, to take the work away from our union members.

Senator ELLENDER. In what respect? What did they do? Cannot you protect your interests there? I do not see why you cannot.

Mrs. SASULY. We are making every effort to do so, Senator. The reasons, or the reason, the shippers were able to do this, is that they had this supply of Mexican nationals on hand. They used them to do the stoop labor ordinarily done by the regular domestic workers and the domestic field workers were put into these mobile units.

Senator ELLENDER. Of what advantage is it to the grower to employ these Mexican laborers? I understood they had to pay the prevailing wage.

Mrs. SASULY. Well, one thing, I think if the committee were to investigate, they would find there have been very substantial violations of that prevailing wage guaranty.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you know of any instances?

Mrs. SASULY. I have had reported to me instances in Colorado in the sugar-beet fields, and I know this: In Imperial Valley, 1943 or 1944, the bringing in of the Mexican nationals had a very substantial and immediate effect on the prevailing wage. You had a prevailing wage in Imperial Valley of somewhere around \$1, maybe a little over, an hour at that time.

When a group of Mexican nationals were brought in, the prevailing wage fell to 75 cents an hour.

Senator ELLENDER. For the same kind of work?

Mrs. SASULY. That is right.

Senator ELLENDER. What is the prevailing wage under such circumstances?

Mrs. SASULY. It was over \$1 an hour. The bringing in of the nationals brought it down to 75 cents an hour. Even if the prevailing wage were paid, then what you have is a lowering of the prevailing wage for our own workers, because other workers are brought in.

My union has many minorities, minority groups, in it. We have many Spanish-American workers, many Mexican workers, many Negro workers. Our position on this is in no way directed against a minority group. It is to protect the interest of the minority group, large proportions of whom are employed in agriculture in this country.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Are the Mexican nationals hauled in trucks to these mobile units? Do the Mexican nationals live in these trucks?

Mrs. SASULY. These trailers I have been describing are the actual production operation, the packing shed, where they trim and pack the lettuce, or wash and pack the carrots, or broccoli, as the case may be.

Senator AIKEN. Instead of transporting the crops to the packing shed, they transport the packing shed to the crops?

Mrs. SASULY. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. It is a new method. It is with the times. I presume that because you do not have those who do the stoop work organized, it is possible then there would be some encroachment there.

Have you any union members following these trailers around doing some of that actual work of washing and packing?

Mrs. SASULY. To my knowledge, none of our regular members have done this work in the trailers.

Senator ELLENDER. Why?

Mrs. SASULY. I think chiefly because steps have been taken by the shippers to set up these trailers to prevent them from doing it.

Senator AIKEN. Do many of the Mexican nationals join the union?

Mrs. SASULY. There has been quite a confused situation on that question. For a number of years it was spread about quite widely, by whom I am not sure, but anyway spread about quite widely among the Mexican nationals they were not allowed to join unions in the United States. There was a great deal of propaganda to this effect. This was one of the very bad aspects of the program.

The international agreement, as interpreted by the State Department and the Foreign Secretary of the Mexican Government, allows Mexican nationals to join any union they wish—in the States.

I think the reason for this misinterpretation was that in the agreement it does say that the workers shall be represented by one or more from among their own group, which was written into the agreement according to my understanding by the Mexican Government in order to protect the Mexican nationals against exploitation by any outside interest, but in no way was intended to prevent the free right of choice to join a union in the United States if they wished.

However, there was a great deal of propaganda to this effect. We found it particularly harmful in cases where Mexican nationals were in violation of the agreement, and put to work in packing sheds. I am not talking about these mobile sheds now, which is a new development, but put to work in packing sheds in violation of the agreement. This happened in California.

We would have a Labor Board election in the packing shed, and these nationals had been told, and I do not know by whom, but there was a great deal of propaganda going around. I am sure the

grower-shipper gave them a lot. Maybe some Government representatives did. I do not know that they were not allowed to join a union.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Speaking about the beet workers in Colorado and South Dakota, do they join the union?

Mrs. SASULY. We have no organization in South Dakota, Senator.

I would like to say a word about the sugar-beet workers in Colorado. According to the reports we get from our representatives, this year in Colorado the beet workers are making a demand, and they are not really organized in a union, this is just a demand from among the workers. We do not have them organized in a local union. They are making a demand for an annual wage guaranty of \$550.

I think that is a pretty appalling fact, that in a situation where the workers are asking for \$550 a year as an annual guaranty, you have certain of these sugar people coming in here and telling you they need Mexican nationals to work in sugar beets.

Senator Chavez has asked me to read to you a letter which he received from one of his constituents in New Mexico. That goes into this situation, and if I may impose upon your time, I would like very much to do so. May I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mrs. SASULY. This is to the Honorable Senator Chavez:

It has recently come to my attention that the "insidious sugar lobby" of the sugar industry of the United States, the associated farmers, and the beet growers of the country are poised in Washington, ready to pounce on Congress for additional appropriations running into millions of dollars for the purpose of continuing the importation of agricultural workers from foreign countries.

Therefore, I believe it is time that a few of us interested in the welfare of our own American agricultural workers put in a few licks, even though at long distance. As you know, \$24,000,000 were appropriated for this purpose during the fiscal year ending December 31, 1946, and by July 59,000 workers had been imported into the country, mostly from Jamaica and Mexico, according to the figures released by the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics. It is very probable that the total figure was nearly doubled by the end of the year, since thousands of workers were brought into the Rocky Mountain region from Mexico for the purpose of completing the harvest of sugar beets. As you know, the importation of foreign workers is carried through by international agreements between the various countries of recruitment and the United States, which guarantee to the foreign workers transportation, health protection, insurance against employment accidents, adequate housing standards, medical care, and certain earning minimums.

None of these guaranties are made to our own American citizens, who are recruited within the United States and who for years have performed agricultural work and produced the crops for which our country so clamored during the war years. In the Rocky Mountain region, which comprises the States producing the largest amount of sugar beets, there were over 6,000 foreign workers employed during the season of 1946. These States, which include Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico, have for decades relied primarily on the recruitment of agricultural workers from the Southwest. A large proportion of these workers were furnished by our own State of New Mexico.

During the war years the program of the importation of foreign workers could be well justified by the production demands of our war effort. However, in nearly every State comprising the Rocky Mountain region the employment of foreign workers has been used to hold the wages of domestic workers at substandard scales. During the war years our workers had a choice of performing agricultural work at persistent low wages or of obtaining other types of employment which paid them a living wage. With the termination of the war and the curtailment of industrial jobs and job opportunities, many of our own workers are returning to the agricultural fields for employment, and it appears to me as sheer

nonsense to continue the appropriation of millions of dollars which are used for the exploitation of our own workers and to the exclusive benefit of a few corporate groups. I am referring to the more than \$300,000,000 of annual subsidy which the sugar industry is receiving in the United States at the present time, exclusive of the millions of dollars appropriated to aid the industry in producing sugar beets at substandard wage scales and due to the fact that although the importation of foreign workers was considered an emergency measure during the war years, the program is in danger of perpetuation by continuous subsidy by the Federal Government.

I would like to reemphasize here with all this talk of economy, I cannot understand why money should be spent to subsidize a program which is cutting the wages of our own workers in this country. I do not understand what this economy talk means if this is being done. It does not make any sense to me.

Senator ELLENDER. In that connection, we use foreign labor in my section. If it had not been for importations, we would have lost a lot of sugarcane.

Mrs. SASULY. Well, Senator, I am not familiar with the situation there. I know that was true during the war in many areas, but the question is, I think: Is it true today?

Senator ELLENDER. A lot of people are working in factories. They have got good jobs there, most of them at least, and a good many of them learned during the war how to work in factories. Some of the farm hands became welders. Many of them are now too proud, as it were, to go back to field work.

Mrs. SASULY. I do not know the information for your State, but today in Los Angeles County in southern California, which is one of the richest agricultural counties in the entire United States, there are 410,000 unemployed, which is 10,000 over the figure for April 1940; 410,000 unemployed.

Senator ELLENDER. Did they work in the field?

Mrs. SASULY. Many of those workers are workers who, as you have just described, Senator, went into war work from agriculture. The reports from every single farm-labor source which we have checked in southern California, Los Angeles County, Imperial County, and the surrounding areas, indicate that there is plenty of agricultural labor available for the navel season which is coming up and for the valencia season which is practically at its peak in southern California.

There is a continuing and increasing immigration of workers into the State. In California you have a situation which is practically a duplicate of what we had in the 1930's. All of these farm-labor supply sections are overflowing with workers. The people have not seen anything like that since the late 1930's.

Senator KEM. Are you familiar with the situation in Maricopa County, Ariz.?

Mrs. SASULY. I am in a general way, Senator.

Senator KEM. I have a telegram from J. Kearns Plaoche, whose address is P. O. Box 378, Avondale, Ariz. He says, in part:

Recently in Maricopa County, Ariz., from 70 to 150 agricultural workers were requesting work every day and were told that no jobs were available. Yet at the same time, about 1,000 Mexican nationals were employed in the county.

Mrs. SASULY. That is a very similar report to reports I have from Arizona.

Senator KEM. Do you have any information about conditions in Pinal County, Ariz.?

Mrs. SASULY. I do not have by counties for Arizona.

Senator KEM. My informant goes on to say:

In Pinal County, Ariz., the county agricultural agent had the courage to force the removal of Mexican nationals over strenuous objection of large vegetable growers, and today American workers are working in those jobs and feeding their wives and children. If growers and office of labor of United States Department of Agriculture had had their way Americans would still be out of work and their families hungry.

Mrs. SASULY. I think it was that kind of a situation in Arizona, Senator, which led the Governor of the State and the board of regents of the University of Arizona to go on record in opposition to any further import of Mexican nationals last year.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to interrupt the witness to this extent: That there is no question in my mind that we need to import the Mexican or foreign workers. There is no question in my mind but what we can find enough help in the United States to do the job, but there is a question of whether we can continue the program in this manner and assist in the allocation of the worker to the area if the shift demands a high employment.

My only concern here and my only reason for supporting the program for the balance of this calendar year is that we are still not completely reconverted or readjusted to a peacetime existence in the United States. We had a concentration in factory areas during the war. We had a removal of a lot of natives, as it were, in California, but they were of Japanese blood and that people or race of people have not returned to the west coast. So, we have not the normal number of stoop laborers in the area of the west coast.

My only concern is that we are still committed to a very high food production in the United States in order that we can feed our own and also ship abroad to the people that are hungry and starving.

So, we are asking ourselves to go to an extremely high production in the United States. If you have a high production of canned crops, sweet corn, peas, and we need a high production of the root crops, that is, your sugar beets, all of it requires a great deal of hand labor.

We have no means of supplementing or substituting for hand labor.

The fact is there will be areas where we are going to have to meet a peak manual labor demand. We are going to have to recruit them. Some will be recruited here and some there, but we are going to have to concentrate them.

My only reason for supporting this type of employment agency or a force is we may have the mechanics to recruit workers in the vicinity of Kansas City to meet a peak demand at Denver, Colo., or a peak demand at San Diego or San Francisco or any other area in the United States.

I use those names of cities as examples.

That is my only concern. However, if I thought for 1 moment that a worker was left unemployed at St. Louis or Kansas City and a Mexican or a foreigner, whether he be a Mexican or a Jamaican, was imported to take his place, I would be the loudest in denouncing such an action.

However, in order that your worker, the common laborer, may have an opportunity, I would like to see an agency that could go into Kansas City and say, "There are 5,000 workers here that cannot find

work today, but there are a number of jobs pending for the workers on the west coast. Who is going to mobilize those workers and get them there?"

That is my only concern and that is the only reason I support this, but I think you are entirely right when you say there is no need for importation of workers.

Mrs. SASULY. Senator, I am in total agreement with your proposal that there be an over-all means of mobilizing workers within the United States.

This was what our union proposed during the war.

In Public Law 45, in Public Law 229, and in the subsequent extensions of that legislation, those powers were taken from the Farm Labor office, which was originally in the Farm Security Administration and then was taken up and set up as a special division within the Department.

Those powers were taken away. All recruitment is done by the State extension service, according to my understanding. It is only within a State that there can be any mobilization, and as far as doing what you suggest, Senator, which I think is exactly what should be done, there is no agency to do that.

Why does not your committee, if I may propose it, give such powers to an agency which we feel should be the Department of Labor since the Department of Labor has to do with labor?

I think it would be a very fine thing. I think it would be a very fine thing, furthermore, if agricultural workers had the same type of guaranty other workers have, if they were covered by social-security legislation, which they are not, if they were covered by minimum-wage legislation, which they are not.

The workers imported into this country have a 30-cent an hour guaranty. Meager and inadequate though this is, our workers do not even have that guaranty.

Senator AIKEN. One of our troubles during the war in recruiting farm labor from the low-cost areas where there was supposed to be a surplus of labor, was that recruiting had to have the consent of the officials of the county agent, I believe it was.

Mrs. SASULY. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. The counties that had quite a lot of farm labor at a low price, low wage, naturally were not too much in favor of having their labor go to some better-paying area for fear they would not come back.

They probably would not come back if they could get 75 cents an hour instead of 25 somewhere else.

Mrs. SASULY. During the war our union tried to make a contribution to the war effort in the State of Florida. When the citrus season ended, we recruited, I believe it was, 550 citrus workers who were unemployed.

It was the end of the citrus workers' season. We recruited them to go to work during the tomato season in the plant of the Campbell Soup Co., in Camden, N. J., where we have a contract. We thought that this was a very sensible thing to do because these workers were unemployed in Florida.

It was planned that they would go to work in the tomato season in Campbell Soup and they would come back to Florida. This was

done under the auspices of the War Manpower Commission, in cooperation with the Campbell Soup Co. and with the Office of Defense Transportation, which arranged for the train to take them up.

As a result of our effort to make a contribution to the war, our representative in the State of Florida was arrested under the emigrant-agent law of that State. I am not quite sure whether his case is still pending on appeal or whether the \$2,500 fine which was assessed on him has been paid.

However, that is the kind of thing that happened when we tried in our own small way to get labor from where there was a surplus to where it was needed because there was no over-all program by the Federal Government for such mobilization.

Senator YOUNG. Each year in North Dakota we have to import, I think, around 8,000 or 10,000 workers. If your union could go to our State government and say, "We will furnish 5,000 of those workers," I am sure our State would much rather have your workers than they would the Mexican workers.

Mrs. SASULY. We got pretty discouraged after having our representative arrested under the emigrant-agent law. There are 11 States in the South which have such laws.

We think the Federal Government should step in and do it. We tried, and our man almost went to jail.

Senator KEM. Mr. Plauche makes in this telegram what I think is an interesting observation:

Is Government sponsoring and financing a program of controlled labor at controlled wages, which is the very antithesis of fundamental American principles of free labor in a free economy?

Would you care to comment on that?

Mrs. SASULY. Well, I think the control consists of depressing wages. I think that is the type of control which is being exerted by this program.

I believe that the type of control that should be exerted is, first of all, a national program for mobilization; and, secondly, I believe that in the areas where there may be some real farm-labor shortages, and perhaps there are such areas, although I have not come across any—

Senator KEM. In general, do you consider a free-labor principle with wages made in the open market as an American principle?

Mrs. SASULY. Of course, I am in favor of free labor whose wages are determined by collective bargaining. However, I believe there should be a legal minimum wage for agricultural labor just as there is for all other labor.

Senator KEM. The wages are fixed by bureaucratic control in Washington, are they not, the wages to be paid to these Mexican nationals brought in under contract?

Mrs. SASULY. There has been a 30-cent minimum, which has been completely unsatisfactory and unrealistic because wages have been above the 30-cent minimum in most areas outside, perhaps some areas of the South.

Senator KEM. You do not consider it is fair to refer to these people as controlled labor at controlled wages, then.

Mrs. SASULY. No; that is not the point, as I see it. I do want to ask your committee which is concerning itself with agricultural labor, if I may be permitted to ask a question, whether there is any thought

on the part of the committee of considering the very vital fact that farm workers are class B citizens.

They do not even have social security coverage. They do not have workmen's compensation coverage. They do not come under the National Labor Relations Act.

If there are real shortages in any place, do you not think there would be more incentive for people to go to work in agriculture if they had the same benefits other workers have?

Senator THOMAS. Let me say at this point that the Government does not consider that the farmer's wages is worth anything because they refuse to recognize the value of his wages in connection with his parity formula.

The farmer is supposed to work 24 hours a day, if necessary, and yet his work is worthless. That may account for all this nonrecognition by the Government of farm wages.

Mrs. SASULY. Well, there certainly is no recognition of it, and frankly, how can you expect workers to go into agriculture, when by going into agriculture to work, they thereby take themselves out of a status of an ordinary citizen of the United States, with certain rights, with certain protections, and become declassed?

They have no rights whatsoever.

Senator ELLENDER. How about the farmers? Would you guarantee them a certain return?

Mrs. SASULY. Yes, certainly. Our organization has always been in favor of the price-support program.

Senator ELLENDER. But you get it as cheap as you can.

Mrs. SASULY. We think a great deal of it is frittered away in the middle between the farmer and the ultimate consumer. We are certainly in favor of a fair price for the farmer, and we have supported such programs.

Senator KEM. Do you know of any other class of American labor that is being subjected to competition of foreign labor brought in under contract?

Mrs. SASULY. I am not familiar with any at present. I believe that there have been some foreign workers brought in in the logging industry.

Senator AIKEN. We brought in some miners. It did not work out very well because they did not mine very well. They had to let them go.

Mrs. SASULY. During the war there were railroad workers brought in.

Senator KEM. Are those programs still in effect?

Mrs. SASULY. I do not know whether the importation of Mexican workers for railroad labor is at present continuing or not. I cannot answer that, but the only large numbers that were brought in were brought in for agricultural labor.

I cannot help drawing the conclusion that the reason this happens in the field of agricultural labor is that these workers are largely unorganized. We have very few of them organized in our union.

They are unprotected under any laws, and they are the easiest group to exploit.

They have low wages and they are subjected to every kind of intimidation and discrimination.

Perhaps this was necessary as an emergency measure during the war, but we find no reason for its continuation now.

I would like to read the rest of that letter into the record:

In checking with the local State employment service of Taos County, I find that over 100 families were recruited from this country for employment in agriculture in Colorado, in addition to the uncounted numbers who might have gone to work in agriculture, and of which the employment service did not have a record. In the same proportion, all of the counties in northern New Mexico contribute a large proportion of workers to agriculture each year. This migration of agricultural workers will increase as the opportunities of employment in industry decrease.

Therefore, as Senator from the State of New Mexico, I beg of you to use all of your influence against the continuation of appropriations from the Federal Government for the importation of additional foreign labor in 1947. It would be sheer nonsense to deny that a shortage of workers in agriculture will not exist without importation of foreign workers. However, such a shortage could come only as a result of lack of proper distribution and adequate wage scales together with lack of housing for family workers who migrate from one section to another to perform the required seasonal tasks in the different areas.

During the season of 1946, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, the majority of the imported workers were used in two regions—the Western States, including Washington, Oregon, and California, and the Rocky Mountain region which I have already enumerated. If the millions of dollars spent for the importation of agricultural workers were spent for the improvement of migratory labor camps and in assisting with the transportation problems involved in the moving of people from one area to another to perform the required work, it would solve the agricultural labor program. Such a plan was on its way to success through the Farm Security Administration prior to the beginning of the war when all of the attention was turned over to the importation of foreign workers and our own domestic workers were neglected. It is my belief that such a program as existed under the Farm Security Administration should be extended and improved and that the importation of foreign workers should cease at once.

I trust that you will use your influence to bring about any improvement possible on these conditions which affect thousands of our people in northern New Mexico.

Senator YOUNG. I think there is considerable merit to your statement as it concerns California. There has been a large amount of immigration, and it is continuing.

In an area such as ours, we would be out of the sugar-beet picture if it was not for this program for bringing labor up there. That is, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. We are very dependent on this type of labor.

Mrs. SASULY. Well, Senator, would not a program for recruiting and mobilizing domestic workers within the country and perhaps offering them some guaranties meet your needs?

Senator YOUNG. I think this agency should be doing far more along the lines you are suggesting than they are doing. I think all the available help should be taken from this country in preference to foreign help.

Senator ELLENDER. Is not the foreign labor limited, depending upon the amount of local labor available?

They do not let anybody come in. As I understand it, there are a number of local workers to do the job, and then they supplement it with such an amount of foreign labor as may be necessary to do the work.

It is not a question of letting anybody come in, as I understand it.

Mrs. SASULY. That is the program, Senator, and the requirement, but it is the State extension service which do the certifying. I regret to say that all too frequently the extension service expresses, rather than

the actual situation with respect to the number of workers available, the desires of the big growers to get in excess labor supplies so that they can cut wages.

I know the extension service in many parts of California say exactly what the big growers want them to say.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not want to argue it out with you, but I do know that in my section of the country, the prevailing wage must be paid irrespective of how many are brought in.

There is no gain by it. On the contrary, it costs more to the farmer because this foreign labor is producing much less in productivity than native labor. The only reason why we want them is to save the crop.

If it were not for that foreign element, we would have lost everything.

Senator YOUNG. Our farmers have to have help.

Senator KEM. That is during the war, but is that going to be true in peacetime?

Senator ELLENDER. We have not gotten over the hump yet, Senator.

Senator KEM. The war has been over 2 years.

Senator ELLENDER. I understand that; but things are far from being settled. With the situation in Greece and Turkey and what is happening now in Moscow, the world needs a lot of food.

Senator KEM. Referring to this telegram here, this informant of mine makes this interesting suggestion:

I am reminded of the postwar period following World War I when Hugh Johnson said he had a terrible time demobilizing those industries that had been receiving Government subsidies during the war although the need of subsidies for those industries had passed.

Senator ELLENDER. That is a different situation entirely, Senator. The situation following World War II is different from what existed following World War I. Europe was not as badly crippled as it is now, as you know, not by any means.

Germany was in wonderful shape; it continued to produce.

Senator KEM. Our national debt was about one-tenth of what it is today. Our ability to help them was much greater than our ability is now.

Senator ELLENDER. I would not say now because our productivity has increased immensely over what it was.

Senator KEM. What I am interested in is trying to lessen the fall when it comes by turning to sound principles before we have to.

I would like to ask another question. It does not seem to me we have got the facts here about what the domestic labor supply really is. We have a report here on two counties in Arizona and you have some others there in southern California.

Do you know how we could and where we could get some reliable, up-to-date information as to how much domestic labor is available in different parts of the country?

Mrs. SASULY. I think it would be quite easy to make a quick spot check, and I think it would be very valuable if the committee could direct its efforts to that end in the major areas where foreign workers have been brought in and also in the major surplus areas, primarily certain Southern States.

In the areas where the foreign workers have been brought in, a very good index, as I indicated before, is the number of people you have in these farm labor supply centers.

In the Pacific Northwest, for example, the camps that ordinarily close in the winter are now open in a number of towns in Washington and Oregon, open because they are full of people, a great proportion of whom are veterans.

Those veterans have not got jobs. They are sitting in those camps which are open in the winter because they do not have any work.

Senator KEM. Who would you suggest should make this spot check?

Mrs. SASULY. Unfortunately, there is no division having to do with agricultural labor in the Department of Labor. They have, I believe, the best techniques for making such surveys.

However, I do believe the Department of Labor together with the Farm Labor office ought to be able to make such a check.

I think it is very unfortunate there is no division which compiles adequate agricultural labor statistics.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has partial figures, but they are not very adequate.

However, I do think a spot check could be made in time to get a picture for this committee.

Senator KEM. Through the Department of Labor?

Mrs. SASULY. Through the Department of Labor, in cooperation, probably, with the Office of Labor in the Department of Agriculture.

Senator STEWART. What about the census information?

Mrs. SASULY. I understood the Census Bureau information is now coming in for the census.

Senator KEM. Would that be up-to-date information on this point?

Mrs. SASULY. I cannot answer that. I am not sure how far along they are in the current census. I know it is beginning to come in because I have seen some of the releases.

Senator KEM. Is it not a rather anomolous thing for the representative of the Department of Labor to appear here supporting a bill to bring contract labor in the United States in peacetime at Government expense?

Mrs. SASULY. I think so, Senator.

Senator KEM. Do you understand that that is the official position of the Department of Labor on this thing?

Mrs. SASULY. All I know is what I read when I glanced at the transcript. I was not here when the representative testified.

Senator KEM. He was appearing officially, as far as you know?

Mrs. SASULY. As far as I know.

I do hope your committee will consider some positive legislation that will put agricultural labor on the same plan as other workers.

Senator AIKEN. Your belief is if this is continued, it should contain section 2 (a) of the House bill 2102:

The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act—
and so forth—

shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933.

That was in the House bill. It is section 2 (a). That is not in the Senate bill.

Mrs. SASULY. As I understand that, that means that the farm placement service within the USES should be continued.

Senator AIKEN. With the unemployment service.

Mrs. SASULY. I agree with it to this extent: We believe there should be a national farm placement service, and we are not in accord with the situation by which the USES is run by the States.

However, within those limitations, I would agree.

However, we do not agree the whole program is effective because it is limited to a State scale and no over-all mobilization is possible.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

(Thereupon, at 11:30 a. m., an adjournment was taken.) (Mrs. Sasuly's complete statement and additional statements filed with the committee are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. ELIZABETH SASULY, WASHINGTON REPRESENTATIVE, FOOD, TOBACCO, AGRICULTURAL, AND ALLIED WORKERS OF AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 12, 1947

I am appearing on behalf of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America and the Congress of Industrial Organizations with which FTA is affiliated.

WARTIME PROGRAM

The program of farm labor importation was supported during the war by FTA and by CIO. It was supported because there were in some instances real labor shortages and labor was needed to produce food. However, importation of foreign workers even during the war would not have been necessary had there been an attempt rationally to distribute and use the labor available in the United States. Our union proposed such a program, investigation by the Kilgore committee established its feasibility, but it was not put into effect. Therefore we supported, in most instances, a program to bring in foreign workers for agricultural labor because the most important consideration was producing to win the war. Since the Congress did not see fit to accomplish this by using the reserves of labor available, particularly in the South, we were forced to and did agree to the importation of foreign workers. I do not wish to dwell unduly on past experiences, but I do want to point out that in 1942 Bahamian workers were brought in to Florida to work in vegetable crops at a time when there were thousands of unemployed agricultural workers in that State.

INTERESTS WORKING FOR EXTENSION OF IMPORTATION

Now we are presented with proposals to continue this program as a peacetime operation. Special interest groups, particularly from California, Florida, and the Rocky Mountain sugar beet States have been propagandizing for a year's extension. I do not think I am overstating the case when I say that these groups would like to see the importation of foreign labor extended for "as long as necessary" to quote the words used by representatives of these groups, and that they wish the determination of "necessity" to be made by the employing groups.

FTA has a record of cooperation with farmers of which it is proud. We have worked with the family farmer, the working farmer, to protect our mutual interests against attempts by the food-processing industries to pay lower prices to farmers and cut the wages of workers in food-processing plants. But these are not the farmers who are crying for importation of foreign workers. As a matter of fact, if the committee wishes to investigate, I believe they will find that during the war when there was a real need for workers in California, the small California farmers found that the big growers—corporation farms covering thousands of acres, and grower-shippers including such companies as American Fruit Growers who speculate in farm production rather than work at it, the interests who created the Associated Farmers—gobbled up the Mexican workers who had come here under the international agreement and the small growers had to fight to get labor.

REAL PURPOSE OF IMPORTATION

The importation of foreign workers has a long history. Over a period of several decades, Mexican workers were illegally brought into the United States to work in California and Arizona in agriculture and in mining. They were shipped back like cattle after they had contributed their labor at starvation wages and to the detriment of the wages and working conditions of United States citizens. There was no question as to the purpose for which they were brought into the States. It was to create or intensify labor surpluses and so cut wages.

Now the wartime program has established a pattern for importation with Government sanctions. The war program undoubtedly made advances over the previous illegal and vicious practices of big growers. These advances were made—we must admit with some shame—not because our Government or our Congress decided to improve the lot of the agricultural worker, but because they were insisted upon by the foreign governments who signed agreements with us, particularly the Mexican Government.

Certain guaranties were made as to wages, health protection, and housing. These guaranties were, unfortunately, widely violated. The first condition—that real need for workers be shown—was not met in the sense that there was a program operating to bring unemployed domestic workers to the scene of local shortages. Payment of prevailing wages was not enforced, and it should be noted that the guaranteed minimum of 30 cents per hour was a meaningless figure in terms of a minimum standard of decency, rising living costs, and actual wages paid in agriculture and industry during the war. However, even these guaranties were not given to our own agricultural workers who produced to win the war.

Today the growers are asking for extension of the program, and the bill before your committee provides for a 6-month extension with a 3-month period for liquidation. Although there have been many protestations that this extension is merely to tide farmers over the 1947 season and not cut off sources of labor in the middle of the crop season, I venture here and now to predict that when Congress reconvenes in January they will be presented with the same pressures they are now receiving to continue the importation program. It should be noted that S. 724, unlike H. R. 2102 passed by the House, will carry the program into the next session of Congress. If the intention were really to liquidate importation at the end of 1947, liquidation should be provided for by the end of the 6-month extension, in December 1947.

The real purpose of the requests for continued importation is to maintain a flexible excess supply of labor which will serve to depress the wages of agricultural workers who are residents of the United States. If there is a real shortage of labor on the farms, and if the big growers who are pushing this program are really desirous of attracting labor, I should like to ask the committee why there have been no proposals for establishing any guaranties for domestic labor. Our own agricultural workers are second-class citizens. They do not have the guaranties provided in the international agreement for foreign workers. They do not have even a 30-cent guaranteed minimum wage. They are not covered by the Social Security Act. They are not covered by workmen's compensation. They do not have the protection of the National Labor Relations Act. If there is such a great desire to recruit agricultural workers and need for agricultural workers, why do not the growers and why does not the Congress offer incentives to secure labor by taking agricultural work out of this disgraceful category? We don't see the big growers coming to Congress and saying that the Social Security Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Wagner Act should be amended to cover agricultural workers and that adequate housing be provided so that agricultural employment would be made more attractive. These proposals were made a few years ago by the La Follette-Thomas committee. Nothing has been done about the proposals.

THERE IS NO NEED FOR FOREIGN WORKERS

I have discussed some of the background of the situation. Now I would like to give the committee specific information with respect to a number of the most important areas where there is an alleged need for use of foreign workers showing that there is no such need. I would also like to tell the committee of the specific problem which is being created for members of my union by this importation program.

In general the pattern in these areas is the same: (1) There is a large and increasing number of unemployed, of whom a great percentage are veterans. (2) War workers are returning to agricultural employment. (3) Employment offices reports show increasing applications for jobs and diminishing numbers of jobs available.

Mechanization of agricultural production which was greatly accelerated during the war in spite of the alleged farm machinery shortage, is now proceeding at an even more rapid pace. In the very producing areas where there are cries of "shortage of labor," workers are daily being displaced by the introduction of machines. Mechanization in the South is building up a pool of displaced farmers, share croppers, and wage workers available for work in other parts of the country.

California

In California the farm labor supply centers are filled to overflowing with workers, and observers whose memories stretch back to the thirties see a repetition of the "Grapes of Wrath" days. In the Pacific Northwest, camps which would ordinarily be closed at this time of year are open because they are full of unemployed workers—a large proportion of whom are veterans.

Since California has employed the largest number of foreign workers—Mexican nationals—and, judging by the requests made for 1947, would continue to do so, I should like to give you a fairly detailed picture of the unemployment situation in that State.

The California State Reconstruction Reemployment Commission on February 11 estimated current unemployment at 410,000, 10,000 above the number of unemployed in April 1940. The California Employment Service in January of this year reported labor surpluses for the State which were fast producing many aspects typical of a depressed labor market. Heavy immigration of workers from other States is continuing, while job openings for unskilled local and in-migrating workers have declined to the vanishing point and evidences of stranded unemployed are increasing. The February report of the California Department of Employment shows a particularly acute problem of unemployment among applicants from minority groups. Canneries and many packing houses in the State have laid off workers as a result of curtailed orders, and these workers are in the heart of the agricultural areas in the State, or in areas closely adjacent to them.

These are not just generalizations. When the situation is broken down in terms of some of the major agricultural counties in the State where the largest numbers of Mexican nationals have been used the picture becomes even sharper.

I should like first to discuss the situation in Imperial Valley where the presence of a surplus of Mexican national workers is creating a special problem for the membership of my union. Our membership here is not made up of agricultural workers. Local 78 of FTA is made up of some 15,000 packing shed workers who pack and prepare for packing the lettuce, mixed vegetable, and a large proportion of the tomato and small fruit crop. This local union covers two States, California and Arizona. A large proportion of its members travel between the Salinas and Watsonville Valleys, Imperial Valley, the San Joaquin Valley and the Salt River Valley of Arizona. After years of struggle they have obtained through collective bargaining, union-shop contracts covering most of these areas.

In Imperial Valley the winter production peak takes place in February. During this month, members of FTA who have customarily for years come to the valley for the lettuce, carrot, and broccoli deals were displaced from jobs because of the presence of Mexican nationals. This is what happened: Grower-shippers placed mobile, mechanized packing sheds in the fields to perform packing operations ordinarily performed in the established sheds with which we have contracts. Workers who in the past were agricultural field workers engaged in what is generally known as stoop labor were employed in these sheds to pack the vegetables. Mexican national workers were employed for the stoop agricultural labor, and the packing-house jobs in the established sheds were taken from our members.

This run-away operation on wheels was begun in only a relatively small way this year, but it indicates why the grower-shippers of Imperial Valley are so interested in the importation of Mexican workers. They not only want to cut wages; they want to bust a union. If the committee will check with the farm-labor office in this area, I think they will get a report which will surprise them. This office believes that the local labor supply is sufficient to meet agricultural needs. The labor force in that area is on the increase as a result of the return of war workers and the influx of workers from out of the State. And estimates

at the Blythe border station show that one-third of those migrating into the State are agricultural workers. During this peak month of February which has just passed, there were hundreds of people out of work in Imperial Valley and there were local agricultural workers who were employed as little as 3 or 4 hours a day because the Mexican national workers had so swelled the agricultural labor force that that was all the work they could get. This is one way of cutting wages. Of course, it is quite true that the shippers might have a hard time persuading the former stoop laborers who worked on the mobile packing sheds to go back to stoop labor unless they pay more money. But they will obviously not pay more money as long as they can draw on the Mexican nationals.

Now, let us turn to Los Angeles County, one of the richest agricultural counties in the United States. In the Los Angeles area, official figures showed 195,000 workers unemployed on February 1, of whom 40,000 were veterans receiving unemployment insurance. This is not seasonal agricultural unemployment. As a matter of fact, the southern California valencia season is now in full swing. And a check of basic industries in this area, including steel, the automotive industry, the electrical industry, and others, confirms the pattern of lay-offs and drop-off in hiring.

In the San Fernando Valley, information from the State department of employment indicates that agricultural jobs in navel-orange season, which will come to a peak within the next few months, can be filled by local job applicants within that area. The Oxnard area reports no difficulties in recruiting from local sources for citrus and vegetable packing houses. Reports from Ventura show that one-third of the local unemployed are agricultural workers who will not be employed as the lemon and orange packing seasons reach a peak because the growers are ready to draw upon a surplus of Mexican national workers which is on hand.

One final remark about California: Mechanical cotton pickers in that State are replacing men and women at the rate of 1 machine where 40 workers were formerly used, and are picking cotton at a cost of \$5 a bale. Cotton is one of the crops in which Mexican nationals were used. Does the committee see any justification for the importation of foreign workers under these circumstances?

Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico

The situation in Arizona is very similar to that in California. The fact that foreign workers are not needed is indicated by the action of the Governor of the State and the board of regents of the University of Arizona who last year went on record opposing any further importation:

There has been a great deal of discussion about the need for Mexican nationals in the sugar-beet fields of the Rocky Mountain area. I wonder if the committee knows that in Colorado beet workers are this year asking for a \$550 a year wage guaranty? Does not this fact suggest that the sugar-beet labor shortage, if any, could be easily alleviated by payment of a decent wage by an industry which is heavily subsidized out of the United States Treasury? I say "payment by industry" advisedly. My union has had occasion in the past to join with the small sugar-beet growers of Colorado in efforts to obtain fair prices for the growers and decent wages for the workers from the companies which control the industry.

And so the sugar-beet industry in the Rocky Mountain States is crying for the continued importation of Mexican workers, but they have not as yet, to my knowledge, granted the demand of the sugar-beet workers for \$550 a year. The use of imported workers in these States has taken jobs away from workers within these very States and in surrounding States. In Colorado there were knifings and fights between local workers and Mexican nationals because the local workers wanted the jobs, and the companies have, according to the information I have received from our representatives, encouraged such strife. These local workers are for the most part Spanish-American workers.

In the neighboring State of New Mexico the fact that importation of nationals is taking away jobs from workers who customarily follow a cycle of migration in the sugar-beet fields is keenly felt. At the request of Senator Chavez, I should like to place in the record the text of a letter which the Senator received from one of his constituents who describes the situation with great clarity:

HON. SENATOR CHAVEZ: It has recently come to my attention that the "insidious sugar lobby" of the sugar industry of the United States, the associated farmers, and the beet growers of the country are poised in Washington ready to pounce on Congress for additional appropriations running into millions of dollars for the purpose of continuing the importation of agricultural workers from foreign countries.

Therefore, I believe it is time that a few of us interested in the welfare of our own American agricultural workers, put in a few licks, even though at long distance. As you know, \$24,000,000 were appropriated for this purpose during the fiscal year ending December 31, 1946, and by July, 59,000 workers had been imported into the country, mostly from Jamaica and Mexico according to the figures released by the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics. It is very probable that the total figure was nearly doubled by the end of the year, since thousands of workers were brought into the Rocky Mountain region from Mexico for the purpose of completing the harvest of sugar beets. As you know, the importation of foreign workers is carried through by international agreements between the various countries of recruitment and the United States, which guarantee to the foreign workers transportation, health protection, insurance against employment accidents, adequate housing standards, medical care, and certain earning minimums.

None of these guaranties are made to our own American citizens who are recruited within the United States, and who for years have performed agricultural work and produced the crops for which our country so clamored during the war years. In the Rocky Mountain region, which comprises the States producing the largest amount of sugar beets, there were over 6,000 foreign workers employed during the season of 1946. These States, which include Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, Arizona, Nevada, Utah, and New Mexico, have for decades relied primarily on the recruitment of agricultural workers from the Southwest. A large proportion of these workers were furnished by our own State of New Mexico.

During the war years, the program of the importation of foreign workers could be well justified by the production demands of our war effort.

However, in nearly every State comprising the Rocky Mountain region, the employment of foreign workers has been used to hold the wages of domestic workers at substandard scales. During the war years, our workers had a choice of performing agricultural work at persistent low wages, or of obtaining other types of employment which paid them a living wage. With the termination of the war, and the curtailment of industrial jobs and job opportunities many of our own workers are returning to the agricultural fields for employment, and it appears to me as sheer nonsense to continue the appropriation of millions of dollars which are used for the exploitation of our own workers and to the exclusive benefit of a few corporate groups. I am referring to the more than \$300,000,000 of annual subsidy which the sugar industry is receiving in the United States at the present time exclusive of the millions of dollars appropriated to aid the industry in producing sugar beets at substandard wage scales and due to the fact that although the importation of foreign workers was considered an emergency measure during the war years, the program is in danger of perpetuation by continuous subsidy by the Federal Government.

In checking with the local State employment service of Taos County, I find that over 100 families were recruited from this county for employment in agriculture in Colorado, in addition to the uncounted numbers who might have gone to work in agriculture, and of which the employment service did not have a record. In the same proportion, all of the counties in northern New Mexico contribute a large proportion of workers to agriculture each year. This migration of agricultural workers will increase as the opportunities of employment in industry decrease.

Therefore, as Senator from the State of New Mexico, I beg of you to use all of your influence against the continuation of appropriations from the Federal Government for the importation of additional foreign labor in 1947. It would be sheer nonsense to deny that a shortage of workers in agriculture will not exist without importation of foreign workers. However, such a shortage could come only as a result of lack of proper distribution and adequate wage scales together with lack of housing for family workers who migrate from one section to another to perform the required seasonal tasks in the different areas.

During the season of 1946, according to the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics, the majority of the imported workers were used in two regions—the Western States, including Washington, Oregon, and California, and the Rocky Mountain region which I have already enumerated. If the millions of dollars spent for the importation of agricultural workers were spent for the improvement of migratory labor camps and in assisting with the transportation problems involved in the moving of people from one area to another to perform the required work, it would solve the agricultural labor program. Such a plan was on its way to success through the Farm Security Administration prior to the beginning of the

war when all of the attention was turned over to the importation of foreign workers and our own domestic workers were neglected. It is my belief that such a program as existed under the Farm Security Administration should be extended and improved and that the importation of foreign workers should cease at once.

I trust that you will use your influence to bring about any improvement possible on these conditions which affect thousands of our people in northern New Mexico.

Sincerely yours,

In conclusion I should like to state that the organizations which I represent oppose the program for importation of foreign labor as provided for in S. 724. The FTA represents large numbers of members of minority groups of Americans. We have a clear record of fighting for their interests. It is for this very reason that we oppose further and unnecessary importation of foreign workers. We wholeheartedly support those few aspects of the program carried on by the Office of Labor of the Department of Agriculture which have provided any benefits to the agricultural workers of this country—the health program and the camps provided for agricultural workers. However, we call to the attention of the committee the fact that the health program services only a small fraction of the agricultural workers and that the “labor supply centers” are inadequate in number and in construction.

Furthermore, the entire program is misplaced in the Department of Agriculture whose function is to serve farmers, not farm workers, and should be in the Department of Labor. The real problems of the agricultural workers will never be solved, nor will the country be saved from a repetition of the tragedy and strife which took place in the 1930's until the two and a half million agricultural workers are taken from their condition of second class citizenship by their inclusion under the basic social and labor legislation which covers all other workers.

STATEMENT FILED BY WALTER J. MASON, NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

This statement represents the point of view of the American Federation of Labor with respect to S. 724, providing for the continuance of the farm labor supply program up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 90 days, which is now before this committee for consideration.

This bill appears to be predicated on the assumption that there is a critical shortage of agricultural labor. It is proposed that the only solution to this problem is the importation of foreign farm labor, despite the fact that the existing wage now being paid farm laborers is substandard in the dominant part of the industry.

Too often problems of this type, affecting basically the public interest, are misconstrued by misleading statements developed in such form and manner that may cause a misunderstanding of the situation.

Under these circumstances it becomes necessary that I point out the importance of Congress considering all aspects of our economic problem before permitting the importation of foreign labor into this country during peacetime.

The American Federation of Labor is firmly opposed to the enactment of S. 724, or any other bill providing for the importation of foreign labor, particularly, at a time when unemployment is increasing daily and is now well over the 2,000,000 mark. It is our sincere and considered judgment that the continuation of this program will be a menace to labor in this country and become a serious threat to our entire economy.

THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

The farm labor supply program was originally established in 1943 under Public Law 45, Seventy-seventh Congress. This act was supplemented by the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 299, Seventy-eighth Congress, title 1), as amended, which permits the entry of native-born agricultural workers from any country in the Western Hemisphere. The act exempts agricultural laborers from (1) payment of head tax; (2) the literacy test; (3) the contract-labor provisions; and (4) registration under the provisions of the Alien Act of 1940. They must be in the possession of an identification card, but not

required to have a passport or any other entry document. This act was enacted as a wartime measure and terminates on June 30, 1947.

Since 1943 Congress has appropriated over \$100,000,000 to this program. The cost of recruiting, transporting, housing, and guaranteeing of wage to foreign workers for another 9 months would cost in the neighborhood of \$25,000,000. Surely it is not tenable 2 years after the end of hostilities to spend this additional sum on a wartime emergency problem which no longer exists. Particularly is this true in view of the fact that the major portion of foreign labor recruited under this program is provided for large corporate farmers, beet-sugar industry, and to some extent commercial processors.

The agricultural situation in regard to manpower generated into prominence by the Nation's need for maximizing agricultural production in time of war. This shortage of manpower was caused by thousands of farm laborers leaving the farms to enter military service and to seek more profitable employment in cities or industrial centers to improve their living standards. Although this program affected to some extent the movement of the farm wage rates, it would have undoubtedly improved to greater extent the depressed conditions of the farm laborers in the absence of such a program.

The farm wage rates for the entire country on January 1, 1947, averaged \$4.83 per day without board. Rates per day without board were about \$8 in the Pacific States and averaged less than \$4 in the South. The lowest rates were paid in the East-South-Central States, where they averaged \$3.28 per day without board (Farm Labor Bulletin, January 13, 1947, United States Department of Agriculture).

Although the Department of Agriculture maintained that this program has not brought about a reduction in wage rates, there is no assurance that the continuation of this program will not preserve a status quo below the wages that might be obtained by domestic farm labor if normal competition were permitted.

The supporters of this bill are organizations representing large commercialized farm interests of this country. They expect Congress to continue a program which will subsidize large-scale farm operations at the expense of unemployed domestic farm laborers. This would make it possible for them to maintain a substandard wage in this industry through a threat of bringing in foreign laborers.

Although it is certainly true that the program protects the foreign worker as never before, and that in theory foreign labor will not be used to depress farm wages or take jobs from unemployed domestic farm laborers, there still remains several dangerous aspects to the continuation of this program:

- (1) Will increase unemployment by reason of the fact that domestic farm labor will drift into cities or industrial areas and there become competitors with labor. Instead of producing on the farm, they are sharing with labor the work that is performed in industry.
- (2) All decisions as to availability of domestic workers and as to the prevailing rates are left solely to the Department of Agriculture.
- (3) Farmers may come to depend upon the Government to provide a labor supply from abroad and consequently pressure for a permanent program.

It is the opinion of the American Federation of Labor that serious consideration should be given to the possibility of utilizing the funds and provisions of this bill to recruit and furnish domestic labor from depressed rural regions for use in peak seasons in areas of scarce labor supplies.

Data, which have publicly been available throughout the Nation, indicate that large numbers of workers who were recruited from rural areas for defense-plant employment have created a labor problem in many metropolitan areas by virtue of there being no jobs to offer them and as a result benefit payments under the employment-insurance program have been and are being made. Thousands of them are former farm laborers who would return to the farms if an opportunity is given them to earn a living wage.

Prior to the war, there were definite patterns of migration from areas of labor supply to areas of agricultural-labor need. These patterns are principally:

- (a) Movement of workers from the extreme southern end of the Atlantic seaboard on a progressive basis in keeping with the crop seasons, northward as far as New York and the lower area of the New England States. Before the war this particular movement ranged from 15,000 to 25,000 workers. At the lowest point during the war, this movement dropped to 8,000 or 9,000, and last year, on the basis of information available, had increased almost to the level of the prewar period.

(b) The major migrant area is the Southwest. Prior to the war there were between thirty and fifty thousand Spanish-Americans who moved northward into the Rocky Mountain beet area, the upper Mississippi Valley, and the Great Lakes area on sugar beet and other crop activity. At the low point during the war, this movement had declined to approximately 10,000 workers.

On the basis of data available from the Texas State Labor Department, in 1945 some 32,000 workers were moved by licensed labor recruiters. This does not reflect the self-starting movement, which probably represented an additional 10,000. There will undoubtedly be as many or more available for agricultural employment from this area during the coming year, and while no accurate documentation is available, we understand that considerable movement of migrants has begun to reappear in the Pacific Northwest, and in other areas, in which the prewar migratory pattern was evident.

Furthermore, a telegram received from Maureen Moore, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, of Austin, Tex., on February 13, 1947, states:

"In 1945 there were 21,016 farm laborers sent out of Texas; 906 of these were children under 14 years of age. In 1946 there were 32,444 sent out, and 2,184 of these were children under 14 years of age. It is the opinion of this Department that a like number will be available which is in excess of the normal seasonal migration."

Surely, this information substantiates the fact that sufficient farm labor will be available for the next year without the importation of foreign labor. The truth is, of course, that the shortage of farm labor is an assumption that is unfounded.

In conclusion I again wish to point out that the enactment of this legislation will cause a serious effect on the stability of employment in this country. It secures the continuance of the depressed conditions in the agricultural industry and threatens our entire economic structure. The American Federation of Labor urgently requests that the foreign farm labor supply program be liquidated immediately and is prepared to cooperate with this committee in making a thorough investigation of this program.

STATEMENT FILED BY H. L. MITCHELL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION,
A. F. OF L., MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you have before you a bill to continue the farm labor supply program up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 90 days, which is now before this committee for consideration.

There has been much talk of economy and the prevention of waste and extravagance in Government by the Eightieth Congress.

This bill, which would permit the Department of Agriculture to continue importing foreign labor into the United States for exploitation on the large-scale industrialized farms of the Nation, is the most wasteful and extravagant piece of legislation that this Congress may be called upon to consider.

During the war there could be some justification for bringing in workers from Mexico, the British West Indies, and other foreign countries, to help out in areas where severe labor shortages existed.

According to a statement made by Gen. Graves B. Erskine, the hero of Iwo Jimo, who is now in charge of reemployment and retraining of veterans, over a million American ex-servicemen are now back on the farms and available for such employment as may be offered to them. Surely the Congress of the United States is not going to continue a program that will take jobs away from these ex-servicemen and give them to foreign nationals instead.

The supporters of this bill are the organizations representing the commercialized farm interests of the Nation. They expect Congress to continue a program which will subsidize large-scale farm operations in peacetime. This would make it possible for them to lower farm wages through a threat of bringing in foreign laborers, in the event that the American workers demand fair wages. I submit for the record, copies of minutes and proceedings of several meetings held by a committee representing three major farm organizations and the Agricultural Extension Service, which is known as the Committee for a Permanent Farm

Labor Program. You will note that there is a draft of a bill which would set up a system for supplying farm labor and permit the importation of foreign labor on a permanent basis, without regard to quotas and immigration laws. This material has been made public and the resulting publicity may have had something to do with the proposal now before you to just continue the program for one year. However, such procedure has been followed consistently since 1943, when the first farm labor supply bill was enacted. A resolution has been adopted each year by the Congress to extend the law for a limited period. There was never an adequate hearing on the measure, and I am sure that the Congressmen and Senators never realized that they were voting for a measure which permits foreign workers to take the jobs of American citizens.

The Department of Agriculture's farm labor report for January 1, 1947, shows that there were 25,013 foreign workers still employed in agriculture. These foreign workers should be returned to their homes now and the jobs they are doing should be given to American workers. Last November I was in Phoenix, Ariz., and was told that 2,000 foreign workers from Old Mexico were being brought in to finish harvesting the cotton, fruit, and vegetable crops. I had just left El Paso the day before, and I was informed that there were more than 4,000 native Spanish-speaking American citizens accustomed to doing farm work, who were unemployed in that vicinity. In California, I saw hundreds of jalopies loaded with farm workers traveling the highways looking for work. Most of them were native white American citizens. At the same time, there were 16,017 Mexican nationals working on farms in California, according to the USDA's farm labor report for November 1, 1946.

I also noted that nearly all of the younger men roaming the highways searching for work, wore the emblem of an ex-serviceman on their coat. I observed attractive green and white signs, throughout the Western States, advertising "Farm Labor Office, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Extension Service," and others, inviting itinerant farm workers to apply at the office of the county agent for jobs. I inquired of a number of farm workers as to the type of services they received in those offices—almost without exception they said that it did no good to stop and look for work at those offices. Apparently, those offices do keep some record of the number of people who pass through the towns and cities, as they claim hundreds of thousands of farm workers have been placed on jobs.

One of the reasons advanced for enacting S. 724 is the need for field labor on the sugar-beet farms. It is claimed that farm workers have to be imported from Mexico to perform the stoop labor of thinning and harvesting sugar beets. The labor supply for the sugar-beet fields has always come from among the Spanish-speaking workers of Texas and other Southwestern States. In towns such as San Antonio, Corpus Christi, and El Paso, there are thousands of native American workers available for these jobs. There are more of these Spanish-speaking farm workers available than there were before the war, due to the fact that the immigration authorities let down the bars and permitted the illegal entry of Mexican citizens into the Rio Grande Valley. By accepting low wages, the foreign workers have driven many of the native Americans out of the Rio Grande Valley and these Americans have flocked into Texas cities seeking a better opportunity for a livelihood. These American citizens are entitled to the jobs on the sugar-beet farms.

Further, during the war and since, the efficiency of farm operation has increased, especially on the large-scale commercialized farms where 90 percent of the foreign labor we import has been employed. Less labor is now needed and within 10 years we are going to have to transfer at least one-third of the present farm labor supply to other types of industry.

The only purpose of this bill will serve is to subsidize a group of wealthy farm operators by having the Department of Agriculture furnish them with labor when they need it, at no cost for the recruitment and transportation of workers to and from their farms. They are heartily in favor of continuing the wartime emergency program for supplying farm labor, because the Government assumes all of the costs and full responsibility for workers supplied to them.

We urge that the committee refuse to recommend this bill, and thus end a small part of the waste and extravagance in the operation of the Federal Government.

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Legislative Reports and Service Section
(For Department staff only)

Issued March 13, 1947
For actions of March 12, 1947
80th-1st, No. 47

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	9	Foreign affairs.....	4,10,26	Prices, control.....	3,15
Appropriations.....	3	Labor.....	23	Quarantine, animal.....	24
Budgeting.....	24	Labor, farm.....	2	Reports.....	13
Cotton.....	23	Lands, grazing.....	20	Rubber.....	12
Dairy industry.....	22	Lands, reclamation.....	28	School-lunch program.....	21
Daylight-saving time.....	5	Livestock and meat.....	24	Sugar.....	1,3,18,22
Education.....	16	Minerals.....	11	Taxation.....	29
Electrification, rural.....	8	Natural resources.....	6	Trade, foreign.....	7,11
Flood control.....	19	Personnel.....	14,17	Transportation.....	25,27

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported measure to continue sugar controls (Record does not indicate whether controls would be transferred to USDA). Senate committee reported bill to provide for six-months' extension and final liquidation of farm-labor program. Senate agreed to conference report on urgent deficiency appropriation bill, which rescinds various USDA items.

SENATE

1. SUGAR CONTROLS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S.J.Res. 58, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar (S.Rept. 50) (p. 2024).
2. FARM-LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment H.R. 2102, to provide for a six-month extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor supply program (S. Rept. 52) (p. 2025.)
3. URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL. Agreed to conference report on this bill, H.R. 1968, which rescinds various USDA appropriations and expresses the intent of Congress that OPA be liquidated by June 30, 1947 (pp. 2031-4). This bill will now be sent to the President.
4. FOREIGN RELIEF. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendments S.J. Res. 77, providing for membership and participation by the U.S. in the International Refugee Organization (S.Rept. 51) (p. 2025).
5. DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME. The District of Columbia Committee reported without amendment S. 736, to establish daylight-saving time in D.C. during 1947 (p.2025).
6. NATURAL RESOURCES. Sen. McCarran, Nev., spoke in favor of his bill, S. 35, to provide for an inventory of natural resources and inserted Pathfinder magazine and U.S. News articles favoring such an inventory (pp. 2027-8).
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Received a Kansas Legislature resolution urging the removal of export controls on agricultural products (p. 2023).
8. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. Received a Minn. Electric Cooperative resolution urging the continuation and expansion of the rural-electrification program (p.2024).

9. RECESSED until Fri., Mar. 14 (p. 2068).

HOUSE

10. FOREIGN RELATIONS. Both Houses heard the President's message on the Greek situation (pp. 1998-2000).
11. COPPER IMPORTS. Passed H.R. 2404, to suspend certain copper-import taxes (pp. 2001-17).
12. RUBBER. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H.J.Res. 118, to maintain an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry (H.Rept. 141) (p. 2020)
13. REC REPORT for Aug. 1946 was received (p. 2020).

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. PERSONNEL. H.R. 2521, by Rep. Miller, Calif., to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service. To Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (p. 2020.)
 15. PRICE CONTROL. H.R. 2522, by Rep. Peterson, Fla., to provide certain limitations on penalties or liabilities arising out of Emergency Price Control Act and certain other acts, when the violations on which such penalties or liabilities were incurred were not willful. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 2020.)
 16. EDUCATION. H.R. 2525, by Rep. Morrison, La., to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, etc. To Education and Labor Committee. (p. 2021.)
 17. PERSONNEL. H.Res. 143, by Rep. Powell, N.Y., directing the Education and Labor Committee to conduct an investigation with respect to (1) the exclusion of Negroes as patrons of the public portions of the restaurants and cafeterias in the U.S. Government buildings in D.C. and (2) the exclusion of Negro employees as patrons of the restaurants and cafeterias in the U.S. Government buildings in D.C. To Rules Committee. (p. 2021.)
 18. SUGAR. S. 869, by Sen. Bricker, Ohio (for himself and Sen. McCarthy, Wis.), to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the pricing of sugar, to eliminate rationing of sugar, and to provide for certain inventory controls over sugar. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 2025.)
 19. FLOOD CONTROL. S. 877, by Sen. Brewster, Maine, authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Aroostook River and its tributaries for flood control and other purposes. To Public Works Committee. (p. 2025.)
 20. GRAZING LANDS. S. 881, by Sen. Ecton, Mont., to provide for the leasing of restricted Indian lands under the supervision of the Crow Indian Agency in Mont., and for the limitation of the establishment and size of grazing and range units thereon. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 2025.)
- ## ITEMS IN APPENDIX
21. SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM. Rep. Forand, R.I., inserted a Woonsocket (R.I.) Call article favoring continuation of the school-lunch program (pp. A1050-1).

Most important of all, the rights and integrity of small and peaceful countries must be defended and restored. The long-suffering peoples of the neutral Baltic States still await their liberation, and it is our country's moral right and duty to insist on their liberation.

There is no reason why Lithuania and the other two Baltic Republics should be subjected, nearly 2 years after the cessation of hostilities in Europe, to an unspeakably brutal alien regime maintained by the armed might of one of our former allies.

Furthermore, there is no reason why the legitimate spokesmen for Lithuania—the duly accredited Minister at Washington and the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation—and the respective legitimate spokesmen for Latvia and Estonia, are or should be excluded from presenting in full their views and aspirations before the peace conference on Germany.

We entreat you, Mr. Secretary of State, to give your undivided attention and sympathetic consideration of the views presented herein. We ask you to speak up on behalf of the Government of the United States and to take proper steps for hastening the restoration of freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, whose neutrality has been brutally violated by the Nazi-Soviet conspiracy in aggression.

Respectfully submitted.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
LEONARD SIMUTIS, *President*.
DR. PIUS GRIGAITIS, *Secretary*.
MICHAEL VAIDYLA, *Treasurer*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, with amendments (Rept. No. 51).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 2102. A bill to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm labor-supply program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 52).

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 736) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia during 1947.

This bill was ordered reported to the Senate by the unanimous vote of the members of the committee present at the meeting where it was considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a

nomination which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

John E. Peurifoy, of South Carolina, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

James E. McKenna, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general; and

Patten D. Allen and sundry other persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sundry candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY):

S. 869. A bill to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the pricing of sugar, to eliminate rationing of sugar and to provide for certain inventory controls over sugar and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 870. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John Lone Dog; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 871. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 872. A bill to provide facilities for the mediation of labor disputes and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 873. A bill for the relief of Warren H. McKenney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 874. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Lt. Comdr. Paul A. Smith as alternate representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, and as representative of the United States to the Air Navigation Committee of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, without affecting his status and perquisites as an officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

S. 875. A bill to authorize the President to appoint Maj. Gen. Laurence S. Kuter as representative of the United States to the Interim Council of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization or its successor, without affecting his military status and perquisites; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 876. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 877. A bill authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the Aroostook River and its tributaries for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 878. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcohol Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 879. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Xiriches; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 881. A bill to provide for the leasing of restricted Indian lands under the supervision of the Crow Indian Agency in Montana, and for the limitation of the establishment and size of grazing of range units thereon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 882. A bill for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk; and

S. 883. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 884. A bill for the relief of Eroeda Sinit-skaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 885. A bill to provide that the Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution establishing a joint congressional committee to inquire into the entire field of labor-management relations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution to authorize Herschel V. Johnson, deputy representative of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations to be reappointed to the Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INDUSTRIAL AND LABOR RELATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have today introduced three bills dealing with the problem of industrial and labor relations. Subsequently I issued a statement describing the contents of the three bills in general. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate by reading a statement of that kind. I realize we have much business to do, and I do not wish to occupy the time of the Senate unnecessarily. Therefore at this time I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD the statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IRVING M. IVES, OF NEW YORK

Today I have introduced in the Senate of the United States three bills dealing with the problem of industrial and labor relations. These bills are based not alone on the testimony presented at the recent hearings held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but are also the result of 10 years of personal experience in dealing with the problems inherent in the relationship between management and labor.

The first bill would amend the National (Wagner) Labor Relations Act by providing for employers certain rights which should be basic in their relationship toward their employees.

It would definitely permit an employer to discuss with his employees any matter of mutual interest.

It would protect from the charge of an unfair labor practice any employer who refuses to bargain with his employees on the issue of the closed shop. No employer, however, would be prohibited from thus bargaining with his employees if he should choose to do so.

Under appropriate circumstances, an employer would be permitted to petition the Board for an election.

This bill defines certain unfair labor practices on the part of employees as follows:

Employees who might coerce their employer in the selection of his representatives for the purpose of collective bargaining or who might refuse to bargain collectively with their employer's duly designated representatives or who might conduct a strike or boycott for the purpose of preventing any employer from bargaining with the duly certified representatives of his employees or in order to force an employer to act in violation of his duty to bargain collectively, would be guilty of an unfair labor practice.

In order to be permitted to bargain collectively under the law, any labor organization would be required to file with its petition or charge a statement of the names and addresses of its officers and duly authenticated copies of its constitution and bylaws, and to establish to the satisfaction of the Board that financial reports for the preceding year had been made available for inspection by its members.

Under the second bill which I have introduced, a Federal mediation agency independent of the Department of Labor and under the direction of an Administrator would be created. In addition to performing all of the mediation and conciliation functions now being performed by the United States Conciliation Service, the agency would seek to avert or minimize possible labor disputes by preventive measures. Under the terms of this bill as much effort would be devoted to preventing the disease of industrial strife as to curing it.

By its terms a national labor-management panel, consisting of outstanding leaders of labor and management, would be established for the purpose of advising the Administrator in the prevention and solution of industry-wide disputes and other industrial controversies affecting the general welfare of the country.

Failure of mediation or voluntary arbitration to settle any serious labor dispute endangering the public health, safety, or welfare, would call for the establishment of a board of inquiry to make findings of fact—without recommendation—concerning the dispute and to report such findings to the President who might make them public. This type of fact-finding body, wherever it has been employed, has proved most successful in resolving differences between management and labor.

The third bill, which I have introduced, provides by joint resolution for the creation of a joint congressional committee on labor-management relations to be composed of six Members of the Senate and six Members of the House, with representation to be divided equally between the two major political parties. The relationship between management and labor has no place in partisan politics or as a partisan political issue and the bipartisan nature of the committee thus proposed would eliminate from the area of partisan politics the whole question of industrial and labor relations.

The function of this committee would be not only to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the entire field of industrial and labor relations, including the very complex problem of Nation-wide bargaining, but to consider specifically the effect on the labor-management relationship of existing laws and especially of the statutory changes which are likely to be enacted by the present session of the Congress. This committee would be required to report to the Congress not later than February 15, 1948, making such recommendations as its studies, surveys, and investigations would indicate to be advisable.

Although these proposed bills in no sense cover every aspect of industrial and labor

relations where legislation might be employed, their enactment should go far toward removing the most serious obstacles which now prevent a desirable relationship between workers and employers and toward the attainment of that condition of mutual understanding and responsibility which are vital to happy industrial and labor relations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON LABOR RELATIONS PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 93), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the Eightieth Congress on bills and joint resolutions relative to the labor relations program.

CREATION OR CHARTERING OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS—RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 503, to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, be taken from the calendar and recommitted to the Judiciary Committee. A year ago a similar bill was reported from the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. Apparently now the Red Cross and other organizations are concerned about features of this bill. Therefore, I ask that it be returned to the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill is recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FOR VETERANS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, Senate bill 855 to permit veterans receiving educational benefits under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to receive subsistence allowance for dependents on account of brothers or sisters dependent because of minority or physical or mental incapacity, has been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance.

I suggest that the bill has been erroneously referred to the Committee on Finance, and that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Finance will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND (S. DOC. NO. 18)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on January 3, 1947, pursuant to the provisions of section 201 (b) of the Social Security Act, the Federal Security Agency sent to the Senate the Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors

Insurance Trust Fund. The report involves a matter of very great importance and I think it should be available to all Members of the Senate. I, therefore, request that the report be printed as a Senate document with illustrations, as has been done heretofore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

VALLEY OF A NEW CIVILIZATION—EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Valley of a New Civilization," from the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., for March 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLE OF AMERICA AS INTERNATIONAL ALMONER—LETTER FROM J. K. WELLS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated March 8, 1947, addressed to him by J. K. Wells, of Oklahoma City, discussing certain phases of American foreign policy, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOCRATIC WORLD LOOKS TO UNITED STATES—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Democratic World Looks to United States," written by Sumner Welles, and published in the Washington Post of March 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESSIONAL ASTROLOGY—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congressional Astrology," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post of March 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP IN CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. FERGUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the Republican leadership in Congress, written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Star of March 11, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT BROADCASTING—LETTER FROM E. F. McDONALD, JR.

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter concerning Government broadcasting, addressed to him by E. F. McDonald, Jr., president, Zenith Radio Corp., Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HOOVER DAM—ARTICLE BY WESTBROOK PEGLER

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the restoration of Mr. Hoover's name to the dam on the Colorado River, written by Westbrook Pegler, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF PENNSYLVANIA TURNPIKE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bring the Turnpike Here," published

PROVIDING FOR A SIX MONTHS' EXTENSION AND FINAL LIQUIDATION OF THE FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

MARCH 12 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 2102]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, report thereon with the recommendation that it do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, shall be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier". Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

The amendment would change the bill in two ways. First, an additional period of 30 days is provided for liquidation of the program. It is the opinion of the committee this time would be needed

in order to insure completion of the harvesting of 1947 crops, particularly that of sugar beets, following which the moving of laborers to their homes could be accomplished by January 30, 1947. Second, the amendment would eliminate section 2 (a) of the House bill.

A copy of the report of the House of Representatives (H. Rept. No. 70) is attached hereto and made a part of said report.

[H. Rept. No. 70, 80th Cong., 1st sess.]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6-month extension and final liquidation of the farm labor-supply program, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

STATEMENT

The hearings held by this committee were based on H. R. 1388. Several amendments were adopted and H. R. 2102 was thereupon introduced as a clean bill incorporating these amendments.

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the farm labor-supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title 1), as amended and supplemented, to be continued for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947, and directs that such program be liquidated by December 31, 1947. It also authorizes to be made available until December 31, 1947, all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and other facilities heretofore available under this program by amending section 2 (d) of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), and extending the date for the liquidation of such centers, homes, camps, and other facilities until December 31, 1947.

The farm labor program has provided much needed labor for the planting, cultivating, harvesting, and processing of food crops vitally needed for domestic consumption and export. According to testimony presented at the hearings on this bill, sufficient labor of the kind required by producers and processors of agricultural commodities is not available, and according to recent surveys made by the Department of Agriculture and the State Extension Services, an adequate supply of farm labor will not be available throughout the remainder of this year unless the labor-supply program is continued.

The need for farm labor is particularly acute in connection with the production of sugar beets, fruits, vegetables, and canning crops. The labor requirements in connection with the production of many of these crops are largely seasonal, and the laborers are needed in particular areas for only short periods of time. The laborers must, therefore, be organized in such a manner as to facilitate their movement on into other areas as the season progresses.

Processors and producers are at present negotiating contracts with respect to sugar and canning crops for 1947. Negotiations must also be carried on with foreign governments so that the necessary foreign labor may be obtained as it is needed. Unless farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities are soon given assurance that a sufficient supply of labor will be available to plant, harvest, and process their crops, production of vital agricultural commodities such as sugar beets and sugarcane is likely to be curtailed.

It is the view of the committee that the present emergency farm-labor-supply program should be concluded by December 31, 1947, and that consideration should be given to the need for the development and establishment of a permanent program for the recruitment and placement of farm labor. Accordingly, the Secretary of Agriculture is, under H. R. 2102, directed to liquidate the present emergency farm labor program by December 31, 1947. In order to assure an orderly termination of the program and at the same time make maximum use of such program in obtaining labor throughout the remainder of the year, no date has been specified when the liquidation process is to commence. It is contemplated, however, that liquidation will start as soon as the labor is no longer needed and, in any event, soon enough to permit a complete liquidation of the program by the end of the year, including the return of all foreign workers to their native countries.

To remove any uncertainty as to the continuation of the exemptions from immigration laws and regulations accorded foreign farm workers under section

5 (g) of Public Law 229, the accompanying bill authorizes the extension of such exemptions during the continuation of the program. This continued authority is necessary, because, under the provisions of existing law, the authority for such exemptions terminated with the cessation of hostilities.

Section 2 of the bill is designed to make certain that the emergency farm-labor program as extended by the accompanying bill does not limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or the State public employment services, with respect to the maintenance of a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

During the course of the hearings, it was pointed out that the farm placement service of the United States Employment Service and the State public employment services, authorized under the act of June 6, 1933, was no longer being maintained because the United States Employment Service administratively concluded that funds appropriated for that purpose could no longer be used to maintain a farm placement service as long as the emergency farm-labor program was in effect. Testimony was also presented to the effect that the discontinuance of the farm placement service of the State public employment agencies and the lack of coordination of the emergency farm-labor program of the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges with the State public employment and security offices have made it possible for qualified farm workers to obtain unemployment compensation or servicemen's readjustment allowances, notwithstanding the fact that suitable farm employment was available. Section 2 of the bill is intended to correct this situation by removing such limitations upon the functioning of the State public employment offices as may exist by virtue of the emergency farm-labor program, and by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor to take such action as may be necessary to assure full cooperation between the agricultural extension services and the State public employment agencies, to the end that qualified farm workers may be placed in suitable farm employment if it is available, thereby reducing the number of claimants for unemployment compensation.

The following letter from the Secretary of Agriculture recommends the continuation of the emergency farm-labor program:

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1947, for a report on H. R. 1388, a bill "to provide for continuance of the farm-labor-supply program up to and including June 30, 1948." The bill authorizes the appropriation of "such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance of such program as provided in this act."

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply programs have been provided to June 30, 1947, through—

Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session—\$26,100,000 for 8 months of 1943;

Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$30,000,000 for calendar year 1944;

Public Law 529, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$20,000,000 for calendar year 1945;

Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session—\$25,000,000 for calendar year 1946; and

Public Law 521, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session—\$12,000,000 to June 30, 1947.

Favorable action on H. R. 1388 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm-labor-supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurance at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946 and the type of labor brought in under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the supply of agricultural workers available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

Extension of the authority for the farm-labor program, contained in Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented,

during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1948 will make possible continuation of the farm-labor-supply program during the winter harvest season in certain Southern and Southwestern States. It also provides ample time for the Congress to consider whether any farm-labor program is needed in the postwar years, for the orderly transition from emergency to peacetime activities, and the liquidation of the program during the last 6 months of the 1948 fiscal year.

In extending the program it is necessary that existing facilities continue to be provided for proper housing and feeding of agricultural workers. Those facilities have been made available through permanent and mobile camps. Such facilities are subject to liquidation commencing July 1, 1947, as provided in Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. In order that the necessary housing will be available through the extended period, the amendment to section 2 (d), Public Law 731, as provided in H. R. 1388 is necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2 (a) of rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets; new matter is in italics; existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1946

"SEC. 2. * * *

"(d) All labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities formerly under the supervision or administration of the Farm Security Administration and originally transferred or made available to the War Food Administrator for use in the farm labor supply program pursuant to Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 70), and all similar labor centers, homes, camps, and facilities constructed or acquired by the War Food Administrator or the Department of Agriculture pursuant to subsequent similar laws or otherwise, shall be liquidated as provided in this Act and the proceeds paid to the Treasurer of the United States as each such center, home, camp, or facility is no longer needed in the farm labor supply program originally initiated pursuant to Public Law 45, [or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress, or by the President, whichever is the earlier] *or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier.*"



Calendar No. 49

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

[Report No. 52]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 5 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

MARCH 12 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Reported by Mr. CAPPER, with an amendment

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to
4 the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public
5 Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),
6 as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-
7 lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section
8 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued for a period not to
9 exceed six months after June 30, 1947: *Provided, That*
10 such program shall be liquidated by December 31, 1947.
11 In order to continue to make available for the purposes

1 of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor
 2 camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program,
 3 section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of
 4 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second
 5 session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the fol-
 6 lowing language: "or until six months after the termination
 7 of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolu-
 8 tion of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the
 9 earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language:
 10 "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier". Such
 11 amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and
 12 liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are here-
 13 by authorized to be appropriated.

14 SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

15 (a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appro-
 16 priation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Con-
 17 gress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented,
 18 and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit
 19 or interfere with any of the functions of the United States
 20 Employment Service or State public employment services
 21 with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as
 22 authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

23 (b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of
 24 Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure
 25 maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension

1 services of the land-grant colleges and the State public
2 employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of
3 domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and
4 information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the
5 proper and efficient administration of the State unemploy-
6 ment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's
7 Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

8 *That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to*
9 *the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public*
10 *Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I),*
11 *as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions re-*
12 *lating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section*
13 *5 (g) of such Act, shall be continued up to and including*
14 *December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within*
15 *thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the*
16 *purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor*
17 *homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this*
18 *program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administra-*
19 *tion Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress,*
20 *second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom*
21 *the following language: "or until six months after the*
22 *termination of the present hostilities as determined by con-*
23 *current resolution of the Congress or by the President,*
24 *whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the*
25 *following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is*

1 *the earlier''. Such amounts as may be necessary for the*
2 *continuance and liquidation of such program as provided*
3 *in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.*

4 *SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act the Secretary*
5 *of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such*
6 *action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation*
7 *between the agricultural extension services of the land-*
8 *grant colleges and the State public employment agencies*
9 *in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor*
10 *and in the keeping of such records and information with*
11 *respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and*
12 *efficient administration of the State unemployment compen-*
13 *sations laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjust-*
14 *ment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).*

Passed the House of Representatives March 4, 1947.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS,

Clerk.

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

[Report No. 52]

AN ACT

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 5 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

MARCH 12 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Reported with an amendment

H. R. 2102

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 19 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CAPPER to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes viz:

- 1 On page 3, line 25, and page 4, line 1, strike out “ ‘or
- 2 December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier’ ” and insert in
- 3 lieu thereof “ ‘or January 30, 1948, whichever is the
- 4 earlier’ ”.

3-19-47—A

80TH CONGRESS
1ST Session

H. R. 2102

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. Carper to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

MARCH 19 (legislative day, FEBRUARY 19), 1947

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

80TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 2102

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 7 (legislative day, MARCH 24), 1947

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill add the following new section:

1 SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law,
2 any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country
3 and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to
4 remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply
5 program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural em-
6 ployment: *Provided*, That the employer or employers of
7 such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United
8 States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the

1 terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the
2 Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an
3 appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United
4 States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect
5 that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his
6 place of recruitment or to such other place as the United
7 States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require,
8 without cost to the Government, when such farm employ-
9 ment terminates and, in any event, not later than December
10 31, 1947.

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. KNOWLAND to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

APRIL 7 (legislative day, MARCH 24), 1947

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 9, 1947
For actions of April 8, 1947
80th-1st, No. 65

CONTENTS

Animal industry.....	4	Foreign affairs.....	6	Property, surplus.....	3, 7
Arbor day.....	5	Labor, farm.....	2	Remount service.....	4
C.C.C.....	1	Monopolies.....	8	Trade, foreign.....	8

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill to continue CCC until June 30, 1948. Senate passed bill to continue farm-labor program for 6 months. Senate vacated passage of bill to authorize RFC to purchase surplus property for resale to small business. Senate debated Greek-Turkish aid bill.

SENATE

1. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Passed, as reported and without debate, S. 350, to continue CCC as a U. S. agency until June 30, 1948 (p. 3316).
2. FARM LABOR. Passed with amendments H. R. 2102, to continue the farm-labor supply program for 6 months (pp. 3300-15). Sens. Aiken, Bushfield, Young, Thomas of Okla., and Ellender were appointed conferees (p. 3315). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Knowland, Calif., permitting Mexican farm laborers to remain in the U. S. as long as the program is in effect but not later than Dec. 31, 1947 (p. 3306). (Otherwise the bill, as passed by the Senate, is the same as reported to the Senate.) Rejected an amendment by Sen. Kem, Mo., to require employers to reimburse the Government for recruitment and transportation of off-shore employees (pp. 3306-14), and an amendment by Sen. Ball, Minn., to require that this program shall not be construed to interfere with the functions of USES or State employment services regarding a farm placement service (p. 3314).
3. SURPLUS PROPERTY. Reconsidered the passage of H. R. 2535, to authorize RFC to purchase surplus property for resale to small business, and returned it to the calendar (p. 3299). In asking for reconsideration, Sen. White stated that he had been asked to object to passage but had not been able to do so.
4. REMOUNT SERVICE. Received a Calif. Legislature memorial urging continuation of this project (pp. 3293-4).
5. ARBOR DAY. Sen. Butler, Nebr., spoke on the background and significance of Arbor Day, Apr. 10 (pp. 3294-5).
6. FOREIGN RELIEF. Began debate on S. 938, to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey (pp. 3296-9, 3316). As reported, S. 938 authorizes appropriation of \$400,000,000 to provide aid for Greece and Turkey; authorizes the detail of Government employees to those countries; provides for the transfer to, and the procurement for (by manufacture or otherwise), those countries of any articles,

services, and information; authorizes RFC to make advances up to \$100,000,000 until an appropriation is made, and to make allocations from such advances to any Government agency or department; and specifies certain conditions precedent to the receipt of any assistance by these countries, including free access of Government officials and the press.

HOUSE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Wed., Apr. 9.

BILL INTRODUCED

7. SURPLUS PROPERTY. S. 1068, by Sen. Thomas, Okla., to provide for the more expeditious disposal of surplus personal property. To Armed Services Committee. (p. 3294.)

ITEM IN APPENDIX

8. FOREIGN TRADE; MONOPOLIES. Sen. Mores, Oreg., inserted E.H. Levi's (Univ. of Chicago) address, "The Cartel System," in which he discusses the monopolistic trend in foreign countries and in the U.S. (pp. A1638-42).

- o -

COMMITTEE-HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Apr. 9: S. Appropriations, deficiency appropriation bill; S. Public Lands, Gila reclamation project; S. Banking and Currency, housing bill; H. Appropriations, Agricultural appropriation bill (ex.); H. Banking and Currency, Wolcott housing bill; H. Foreign Affairs, Greek-Turkey aid; For Apr. 11: S. Expenditures in the Executive Departments, merger of quarantine services (Fladness and Rohwer to testify).

- o -

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654, or send to Room 113 Adm. Arrangements may be made to be kept advised, routinely, of developments on any particular bill.

- oOo -

neously is helping Greece to rebuild her own competent independence and helping Turkey to preserve hers. On the contrary, it is what would be called, in American idiom, "team ball."

Nor is that all. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has submitted a 25-year long-range program for Greek economic rehabilitation. And mark this! I repeat that this important instrumentality of the United Nations has specifically recommended that Greece should apply to the United States, among others, for temporary aid in launching this rehabilitation. It frankly recognizes the present limitations within which the United Nations operates.

Nor is this all. It is definitely anticipated that the World Bank will step into this situation and carry the major rehabilitation load just as soon as the imminent crisis is surmounted; just as soon as peace and preliminary stability are restored; just as soon as there is any basis whatever for banking credit.

So, Mr. President, the United Nations does have its important place in this historic prospectus. It can do things to help as of today even though its larger availability is a matter for tomorrow. We must use it to the maximum of its possibilities. We must use all of its functions which are available. We must take no unilateral or bilateral action without full and constant notice to this world fraternity, and with full and constant eagerness to have it succeed to our separately assumed responsibilities whenever and wherever this can be done. I frankly regret that when the President spoke to Congress on March 12, he did not simultaneously advise the Secretary General at New York of our intentions, instead of waiting to present indirect notice through our representative on the Security Council 16 days later. It might have allayed needless misunderstanding. Any such misunderstanding is needless because the President himself clearly indicates that he is wedded to the United Nations. Nothing could be clearer than our message delivered to the Security Council by Ambassador Austin on March 28:

The program of economic assistance contemplated by the United States is of an emergency and temporary character. The United States believes that the United Nations and its related agencies should assume the principal responsibility, within their capabilities, for the long-range tasks of assistance required for the reconstruction of Greece. * * * The United States is giving momentum to the United Nations by its present policy. * * * We look forward to the time when such burdens may be carried through the United Nations.

If that is not clear and adequate, Mr. President, certainly nothing remains unsaid in the preamble and amendment which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has added to the pending bill. Certainly I would be the last man in America to sanction any blow at the prestige and authority of the United Nations. But I also hope I would be the last man in America to drain off that prestige and authority by assigning them a total task which, in point of time and resources, would be foredoomed to sin-

ister failure. I am unable to understand how we could undermine an institution dedicated to human rights and fundamental freedom, to independent governments of free men in a free world, when we supplement these dedications with our own direct succor to those who are imminently threatened with their loss, and when we ask the United Nations to hold us to strict accountability for what we do. No, Mr. President, we are not bypassing the United Nations. We are sustaining them. We are serving peace—emphatically including peace for ourselves—when we strive, in prudent time, to arrest those frictions and disintegrations which otherwise could culminate in an atomic war which must never happen.

Mr. President, as I conclude, let me say that your Foreign Relations Committee unanimously recommends the passage of this amended measure. It is regrettable that policies of such magnitude could not have had more time for consideration. I knew nothing of the matter until we were called to the White House on February 27. I repeat, it is unfortunate when such important decisions have to be made on a crisis basis. But we confront a condition, and not a theory. We have made extraordinary efforts in the committee to let in the light. We held public hearings. We heard every citizen who asked to be heard. We resorted to the novel technique of inviting all Senators to contribute to a questionnaire; and we have made public the State Department's categorical replies. We are suggesting some amendments to the bill, aimed generally at tighter controls and specific liaison with the United Nations. But, sir, the truth of the matter is that, even though we had had months of study at our command, Congress does not have an unprejudiced chance to exercise truly independent and objective judgments in such circumstances as we here confront. This statement leads to the final consideration which no Senator can ignore in respect to his decision.

Congress does not enjoy original jurisdiction in foreign relations. That is the prerogative of the Chief Executive. We come in, usually, only at the eleventh hour, when our choice is the lesser of two evils—as in this instance, when we must decide which is the wiser "calculated risk" for us. To be or not to be? To do or not to do? As when we have been asked, upon other occasions, to declare war, the fact is that by the time these issues reach us for ultimate conclusions, we are heavily precommitted by the very fact of the Presidential request. I do not for an instant mean to say we cannot act on our own independent judgments. I do not mean to say that it is not still our solemn duty to act in keeping with our own estimate of the national welfare and security. I do not mean to say that we can either shift or dodge our share of responsibility, and I would not attempt to do so. But I do mean to say that among the paramount factors to which we dare not deny due weight is this: To repudiate the President of the United States at such an hour could display a divisive weakness which might involve far greater jeopardy

than a sturdy display of united strength. We are not free to ignore the price of noncompliance.

In my view, Mr. President, the price of noncompliance in the instant case—in addition to all other reasons for prompt passage of this bill—would be the forfeiture of all hope to effectively influence the attitude of other nations in our peaceful pursuit of international righteousness from now on. It would stunt our moral authority and mute our voice. It would encourage dangerous contempts. It would invite provocative misunderstandings of the tenacity with which we are prepared to defend our fundamental ideals. Mr. President, what would you think if you were a citizen of Athens? Where would you be forced to turn in your hopeless extremity? What would you think if you were a citizen of Ankara? What would you think if you were a citizen of any other of the weary, war-worn nations who are wondering this afternoon whether the torch still burns in the upraised hand of Liberty; whether it is hopeless to struggle on toward democratic freedom? And what would you think, Mr. President, if you were the Politburo in Moscow's Kremlin?

The Foreign Relations Committee, without political division, supports the President of the United States. It does so for the sake of the humanities. It does so for the sake of peace with justice. But above all else, it does so for the sake of the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, yesterday, during the call of the calendar, the Senate passed House bill 2535, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. I had been asked to object to the consideration of the bill when it was reached on the call of the calendar, but I was off the floor when it was reached, and I confess that I defaulted in the request that was made of me.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate passed this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. What is the bill?

Mr. WHITE. It is House bill 2535, a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. I had agreed, as I have said, that I would object to the consideration of the bill, but in the confusion of the day I was off the floor, and I missed the opportunity, and failed in the obligation to ask that the bill be passed over. I now ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? In the absence of objection, the request is granted, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. WHITE. I now ask that the bill be restored to the Senate Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration Order of Business No. 49, House bill 2102, the so-called farm labor bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I find it necessary to object to the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It was not a motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk is about to state the bill by title for information only. The Senator's objection can be entered at a later time.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102. However, if the Senator from Missouri objects to the unanimous-consent request, it will be necessary for me to move that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 49, House bill 2102. So long as objection has been raised, I do so move.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEM. Is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable.

Mr. KEM. I should like to be heard on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, House bill 2102 is the so-called farm labor bill. It provides for an extension of the farm labor program for a period of 6 months after the 1st of July of this year. If this program is to be effective and do any good to the farmers this year, it is essential that the bill be acted upon at this time, because planting is already under way in many parts of the country.

Mr. President, in January 1943 the War Manpower Commission by directive transferred responsibility for farm labor placements from the United States Employment Service to the United States Department of Agriculture. Senate bill 724, which we are now considering really under the title of House bill 2102, would extend for 6 months the farm labor program which has been conducted by the Department of Agriculture and the agricultural extension services of the several States since 1943. The program has provided much-needed labor for the planting, the cultivating, the harvesting, and the processing of food crops vitally

needed for domestic consumption and for export.

According to the testimony adduced at the hearings on the bill, sufficient labor of the kind required by producers and processors of agricultural commodities is not available where needed at the present time. According to the recent surveys made by the Department of Agriculture and the State extension services, an adequate supply of farm labor will not be available during the remainder of this year unless the labor supply program is continued. The present program will continue until July 1 of this year, Mr. President, but, as I have said, planting is already under way, and the farmers do not feel free to go ahead with their full planting until they know whether the farm labor program is to be continued so that they will have labor available for harvesting next fall. It is obviously not to be expected of them that they will proceed to plant crops which they will be unable to harvest.

The need for farm labor is particularly acute in connection with the production of sugar beets, fruits, vegetables, and canning crops. The labor requirement in connection with the production of many of these crops is largely seasonal, but laborers are needed in particular areas for short periods only at this time.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does this program cost the Government anything? Can the Senator tell us what the cost is to the Government?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, indeed. The first such public law was approved April 29, 1943, and it provided \$26,100,000 for the 8 months remaining in that year. Under the next law, approved February 14, 1944, the cost was \$30,000,000. The next law was Public Law No. 529, approved December 22, 1944, which was presumably for the next year, and which carried an appropriation, representing the cost, of \$20,000,000 for the calendar year 1945. There was \$25,000,000 required for the calendar year 1946. The last law, which was approved July 23, 1946, carried an appropriation of \$12,000,000, extending until June 30, 1947.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is any of the money appropriated paid to the imported labor in the way of wages, or does it represent the cost of transportation and administration?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand—Senators who are present will correct me if I am wrong—that at times it has been necessary to pay some of the imported labor for days between jobs, when they were not assigned to employment. I assume that what was thus paid was a minimum amount.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, when an imported laborer is working on a farm, be it a tobacco, beet sugar, or any other kind of farm, he is paid by the man who employs him, and he receives a full day's pay, the full amount; is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that. The laborers have to be paid the prevailing wage for the com-

munity. I have a statement showing some of the prevailing wages, which I shall place in the RECORD a little later on. I should like at this time to show the dependency of such crops upon imported labor. I have before me a table setting forth the estimated farm and value, the percentage of the total value of the crops which are dependent on transported foreign workers for their harvesting. The table shows 34.2 percent of the sugar-beet crop dependent on such workers, 15.8 of the sugarcane crop, 31.3 percent of the sweet-potato crop, 16 percent of the snap-bean crop, 21 percent of the asparagus crop, 56.5 percent of the green-peas crop, and so on. I ask, Mr. President, that this table No. 5, giving the estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers for the calendar year 1946 be inserted in the RECORD at this point, because it gives the percentage of all that was harvested by foreign workers, including tomatoes, onions, celery, and citrus fruits. Thirty-one percent of the citrus crop has depended upon foreign workers for harvesting.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers, calendar year 1946

Crops	Estimated total farm value for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest of crops indicated	Estimated total farm value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers	Estimated value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers as percentage of total farm value ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Field crops:	Thous. of dol.	Thous. of dol.	Percent
Cotton.....	85,200	2,366	2.8
Corn, field.....	350,616	1,443	.4
Corn for seed (hybrid).....	26,235	787	3.0
Hay, alfalfa.....	112,876	5,471	4.8
Hay, other.....	145,796	2,950	2.0
Tobacco.....	485,433	5,585	1.1
Wheat and small grains.....	287,552	3,967	1.3
Miscellaneous ²	171,342	2,722	1.6
Total.....	1,665,050	25,291	1.5
Sugar crops:			
Sugar beets.....	145,361	49,677	34.2
Sugarcane.....	45,968	7,271	15.8
Total.....	191,329	56,948	29.7
Vegetables:			
Potatoes, Irish.....	539,646	44,826	8.3
Potatoes, sweet.....	9,080	2,850	31.3
Snap beans.....	63,074	10,151	16.0
Asparagus.....	30,817	6,481	21.0
Green peas.....	42,622	24,105	56.5
Sweet corn.....	137,322	14,261	10.4
Tomatoes.....	127,051	31,390	24.7
Onions.....	12,253	2,766	22.6
Carrots.....	3,084	425	13.8
Celery.....	16,001	4,206	26.3
Lettuce.....	1,236	194	15.7
Miscellaneous ²	537,526	120,634	22.4
Total.....	1,519,712	262,289	17.3

Footnotes at end of table.

Estimated farm value of crops for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest operations, and estimated percentage and value harvested by transported foreign workers, calendar year 1946—Con.

Crops	Estimated total farm value for States employing transported foreign workers in harvest of crops indicated (1)	Estimated total farm value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers (2)	Estimated value of crops harvested by transported foreign workers as percentage of total farm value ¹ (3)
	<i>Thous. of dol.</i>	<i>Thous. of dol.</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Fruits:			
Apples.....	251,354	23,638	9.4
Peaches.....	126,659	18,227	14.3
Pears.....	39,750	6,465	16.3
Apriots.....	34,329	5,302	15.4
Cherries.....	32,596	5,844	17.9
Grapes.....	193,736	13,262	6.8
Citrus.....	381,528	120,809	31.0
Prunes and plums.....	64,215	7,200	11.2
Miscellaneous ² ..	168,136	12,318	7.3
Total.....	1,292,303	213,065	16.5
Grand total.....	4,668,394	557,593	11.9

¹ Column 2 divided by column 1 rounded to nearest whole number.

² Includes only those crops in which transported foreign workers assisted.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add, in further reply to the Senator from Connecticut, who asked about who paid the workers, that they are paid, as has been said, by the employer, at the prevailing wages for the community, which varied from 30 cents to 45 cents an hour, in Louisiana, up to \$1 an hour and even \$1.05 an hour, on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The reason I raise the question is because some point has been made in my State to the effect that there is involved an exploitation of cheap labor. Does the bill itself guarantee that the farmer who uses imported labor shall pay the prevailing rate of wages for labor of similar kind in the particular locality?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is provided for by agreement entered into with the Department of Agriculture. We have had no reports that there has been an abuse under this program. I think the employer has had to pay the prevailing wage.

There has been one complaint that, by paying the prevailing wage and having an adequate supply of labor available, the wages of local workers are prevented from rising to higher levels. As I recall, such a complaint came from California.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if I may refresh the recollection of the Senator from Vermont, the complaint was made by the CIO.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The CIO appeared before the committee in opposition to the pending bill; but it was supported by the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service directors, and the farm organizations of the country.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it a fact that the Farm Extension Service that handles this matter, as I understand they do, examines very thoroughly into the situation to determine whether or not local farm laborers are available in a particular area before labor is imported?

Mr. AIKEN. That is claimed to be the fact, and as I recall, last year, the Extension Service of the State of New Jersey reported that sufficient domestic labor was available, and some of the imported labor was transported from that State, either back home or to other sections of the country. The local extension service of the State extension service is required to report immediately when sufficient local labor becomes available.

I believe that the State of Connecticut has had some of the foreign labor. I know that my State of Vermont has had a few hundred foreign laborers, but the number has been decreasing until it reached a low point of approximately 25,000 for the entire United States, last December. It is expected, however, that \$10,000,000 will be required for the last 6 months of this year, but it is also contemplated that there shall be an orderly tapering off of the importation of foreign labor, to come to an end on January 1 of this year, with 30 days of grace, or until February 1, during which time the foreign labor employed in the beet fields may conclude their work in the northern fields and factories and be transported back to their homes in the countries of their origin.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, this is merely an extension to cover this particular season?

Mr. AIKEN. It is merely a 6 months' extension, because it is perfectly obvious that with this labor available until July 1 for the planting season, and perhaps the first weeding, no farmer wants to proceed with his planting until he knows whether he is going to have sufficient help to do the harvesting for him next fall.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that, so far as imported foreign labor is concerned, the conditions under which such labor works, and the wages for which it works are the subject of negotiation between the labor departments of the foreign governments and our own State Department. Those matters receive very careful consideration, and after the foreign labor comes here, the agreements are subject to constant policing.

Mr. AIKEN. I should also like to say that the production goals for oils and sugars have been set very high this year, and they are two types of crops which depend upon transient, migratory labor, some of it foreign labor, to carry them through from the time of planting until the time of harvest.

The emergency farm-labor program, however, is divided into two parts. It does not concern itself wholly with foreign labor, but one part of it deals with domestic labor, labor that is local, intra-

state, or interstate, moving between the States. The foreign labor, of course, is brought in from outside the country.

Answering the Senator from Connecticut still further, I will say that under the Agricultural Extension Service, each State is responsible for the conduct of the farm-labor program within its borders; the county agent is in charge in each county, and he is assisted by an advisory committee of farmers and other leaders, including the neighborhood-leader system of the Extension Service. When a State cannot meet its farm-labor requirements by transferring labor between counties, the State director of the extension service certifies to the Federal Extension Service in the case of workers from other States, and to the labor branch if it is a question of foreign workers, the need for additional workers.

I should like to point out also that during the war American farmers and their families contributed approximately 2,150,000,000 man-days of labor each year, whereas the labor which was supplied through this program contributed only from 130,000,000 to 160,000,000 man-days of labor; but it contributed those 130,000,000 to 160,000,000 man-days of labor during the period of the war at strategic places, and at strategic times. Nationals were brought in from Bahama, Barbados, Canada, Jamaica, Mexico, and Newfoundland. During the war a total of 278,763 were imported. As I have said, only about 25,000 remain in this country today.

It has been said, and it was testified by one witness, a very capable witness representing the CIO, that there is now surplus labor in the country. He pointed out industrial centers in California where there already is a surplus of labor. I do not question that. I believe there are many workers who during the war received from \$75 to \$100 a week who are still staying in industrial war plant centers hoping that the days when they earned so much money will return. They are reluctant to return to North Dakota, or South Dakota, or Colorado, or Vermont, and take less money. Consequently the problem of where to obtain the labor still remains.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that the problem is not entirely controlled by general surplus or lack of surplus of labor. Even when we have a surplus of labor, generally speaking, it often is impossible to get that labor to do the stoop labor required in the beet fields. So the two things do not necessarily control each other. We have known periods in Colorado when there was a very generous excess of general labor supply but that labor could not be induced to go into the beet fields and do that type of work.

Mr. AIKEN. That fact was pointed out quite vividly by the director of the Extension Service from the Senator's State of Colorado, that while labor might be available it was still impossible to hire the labor that would do, as the Senator says, stoop labor, the weeding and the picking up and the topping

of the beets which must be done in the sugar-beet field.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator will recall that some of the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was to the effect that there was much unemployment in California. This morning the USES and also the veterans' division of the unemployment service testified that California was the center of the largest general unemployment and that it was also the center of the greatest veterans' unemployment. The witnesses also testified that none of the unemployed veterans are the kind who would be accepted for or who could do the stoop labor. I merely bring that out to refute the argument which was used previously in our committee, to the effect that there was unemployment in California of the nature that could take care of the stoop labor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I well recall the testimony referred to by the Senator from North Dakota, and I appreciate the information given by him as to the labor situation in California. I agree that while there are undoubtedly getting to be pools of surplus labor in certain localities, such labor is not farm labor and is not available to the farmers to use in caring for and harvesting their crops.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The total unemployment in the United States as of today is a little in excess of 2,000,000. Of that number of more than 2,000,000 unemployed, 800,000 are veterans. Those figures indicate that our unemployment is probably the lowest, with the exception of a brief period during the war, that it has been for years. They also indicate that there is still a problem incident to supplying the necessary labor for the production of crops if we are going to feed the world and take care of our own needs.

Mr. AIKEN. It is largely a problem of adjustment and reconversion at present; there is no question about that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that very often too much is made out of general labor-surplus statistics. There is not enough selectivity in the figures. There may be a number of metal miners who may not be working, but it does not follow that they are available for work in the sugar-beet fields, nor does it even follow that such workers are available in other types of metal mining. We learned that in a very graphic way during the war. There were some theorists here who thought that if some of the gold mines and the silver mines were closed down, the labor in those mines would at once become available for work in the copper mines. But it did not become available in the copper mines. Those men stayed where they were or went to work on neighboring ranches. There is a vast difference between working in a copper mine and

working in a gold or silver mine. I am merely suggesting that one can be very badly misled by general over-all statistics as to surplus labor.

Mr. AIKEN. In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to repeat that while agricultural production in this country has been unprecedentedly high during the last 2 years, farmers have had goals set for them this year which requires that this very high level of production be maintained, and in the goals set for this year unusually large amounts of sugar and oil must be produced. The production of sugar, both cane and beet, in this country requires the type of labor which, while it may be in surplus in some industrial centers, is not available for the fields.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLANDERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Does the Senator mean to imply that the ten or twelve million veterans who have returned home are not available for farm labor?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, many of them are engaged in farm labor already.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Are not most of them?

Mr. AIKEN. I would not say that most of them are, but of the 2,000,000 unemployed just referred to by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] it is doubtful that a very large percentage of them are presently available for farm labor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it not a fact that nearly always 2,000,000 people are unemployed in this country?

Mr. AIKEN. I think that is true. If we had no more than 2,000,000 unemployed we would consider we were having pretty good times.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of how many are unemployed, the fact is that the labor that will be performed by imported laborers is not the kind of labor that such unemployed individuals would perform anyway. Is that not true?

Mr. AIKEN. They may not be so located that they can do the farm work needed to be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean they are not located in the sections of the country where farm laborers are needed, and they are not the type of workers who will get down on their hands and knees and work in the sugar-beet fields?

Mr. AIKEN. I further call attention to the fact that the farm-labor program provided by this bill includes domestic labor, and for the transfer of labor in one State to work in another State. It is not confined strictly to the importation of foreign labor, as many think it is.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator understand, as I have been led to believe, that the administrators of the farm

labor recruitment program in this country are actively engaged in endeavoring to secure all the domestic farm labor that it is possible to obtain; and based upon past experience, the foreign importation of labor is simply that which is absolutely necessary to supplement the local labor?

Mr. AIKEN. I so understand.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. YOUNG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The emergency is that we must know what labor is available now if we are to plant crops. It is desperately needed.

Mr. AIKEN. That is why I am seeking to have action taken on the bill at this time. It should be acted upon today. It should have been acted upon a week ago; but it is better to take action now than a week from now.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. As an example of the critical labor shortage which existed last year, and is practically as bad this year, southern farm boys had to be taken to the northern harvest fields to help for 6 or 8 weeks. It is necessary to have this kind of a program in order to furnish transportation for the workers. The program is handled through the Extension Service, which can best contact the farmers.

Mr. AIKEN. That is true. We must have labor on our farms when it is needed. Last year there was a peak of foreign labor of 63,736 during the month of September. Apparently that was the most important harvesting month. The number dropped to 25,013 in December. I understand that approximately that number are still in the country, and that for 6 months beyond the time when the farm-labor program expires according to existing law we shall require about the same number we had last year. It is believed that by the end of this year there will be no further necessity for the importation of foreign laborers, barring unforeseen developments in the agricultural field. The farm-labor program will then be turned back to the State employment bureaus, where it used to be.

The Government is calling for peak production of certain crops which require a high percentage of hand labor. The Government is asking for peak production in order to help avert hunger and suffering in all parts of the world. Therefore I believe, as the committee believes, that it is only good business to assure the farmers that when they plant this spring they will be able to harvest their crops next fall. This program should be continued for another 6 months.

Some data which I had asked for earlier have just been handed to me. This information relates to the domestic farm-labor program, not the foreign farm-labor program. In 1946 there were requests for domestic labor amounting to 1,100,000 farm hands. Those requests

resulted in the placement of domestic labor with 476,000 farmers in this country.

There may be other information which I may give if questions are asked. I have not had time to go over it. I simply offer that information at this time to show that in continuing this program we are still placing several times as much emphasis on recruiting farm labor within our own country as we are in importing it from other countries.

I believe that the bill should be passed today. I renew my motion that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the parliamentary situation? Has not a motion been made prior to this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion was made some time ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the motion acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Then the motion is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, this is really a very acute situation. There is a shortage of sugar, and there are demands for it from all over the world. We have statements from farmers in various parts of the country that unless they know within a few days with respect to the farm-labor situation they are going to plant grain. I have received such messages from the farmers of my State. Grain requires very little labor as compared with sugar beets. Utah is a great sugar-beet-producing State. With the situation as it is, farmers are not going to plant unless they know something about the labor situation. So it is imperative that some action be taken now.

Something has been said as to the cost of foreign farm labor. I can testify as one who has used such labor. It is more expensive than our own labor, and farmers would not use it unless they were compelled to do so. It is necessary, when such labor is brought into the community, to provide barracks. A large part of the cost of such barracks falls upon the farmers. The farmer must transport the foreign workers from the barracks to his farm and back again. This he does not need to do with his local labor.

It seems to me that this bill should be passed today in order that the farmers of the United States may promptly go to work and grow the crops which it has been contemplated they would grow and which are needed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe that the bill has been adequately explained. I will say for the information of the Senate that the bill was endorsed by the Farm Bureau, by the Grange, by the Extension Service, and many other agencies and individuals.

Lest there be some who might call this another subsidy to the farmers, let me explain that it is in no way a subsidy. It is simply another service to farmers, similar to the service rendered to business by the United States Employment Service and other agencies. I hope that on the floor of the Senate it will not be termed a subsidy.

It may be said that this service could be performed by the United States Employment Service. In looking over the budget of that agency I find no provision for it. The United States Employment Service has not had the experience which the Extension Service has had in this work for the past 2 or 3 years.

This situation affects particularly the sugar-beet industry. Increased production of other farm crops is also demanded. The problem can best be handled by the Extension Service. Through the county agents, the Extension Service has perfect contact with farmers in every area of the United States. Through its facilities it can better transport surplus labor from one area to another.

Mr. President, I hope that the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Reed
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kem	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kilgore	Smith
Cain	Knowland	Sparkman
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Chavez	Lucas	Taylor
Connally	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tobey
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Eaton	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hayden	Murray	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102, providing for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes.

Mr. KEM. I rise to address myself to the motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I realize that the Members of this body are anxious to serve the best interests of the American farmer. He deserves our consideration, and I join the other Senators in that anxiety. I shall enthusiastically support

any measure which I deem to be for his best interests. I think what the wise American farmer is most interested in today is that the Government be kept in such condition that it will be able to render him assistance in the future, as it has in the past, if again he should need it.

I do not regard the measure presently under discussion as being for the best interests of the American farmer. The proponents of the bill have been particularly interested in the welfare of the beet-sugar producer. Under a bill passed a few days ago, there will be no ceiling prices on sugar after October 31 of the present year. All reports indicate that a record crop will be planted. The producer will be prosperous and should be in a position to employ labor at his own expense at the market price. The sugar, the end product, will be bought largely by the American housewife, in the open market, at prices in all probability substantially higher than those which now prevail.

Mr. President, the bill for which present consideration has been moved may accurately and intelligently be described as being a bill, first, to import foreign contract labor into the United States to compete with the American workingman, in violation of established American principle and tradition that such shall not be done except under the emergency of war; second, to subject the small-scale American farmer who works with his hands to unfair competition by granting to the employer of foreign contract labor a subsidy not granted to others; third, to deplete further the Treasury of the United States; and fourth, for other purposes and with other effects which do not readily appear on the surface.

Mr. President, the hearings on this bill were completed on March 12, 1947. On March 25, at the request of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the committee ordered the hearings to be printed. They have not as yet been received from the printer, and are not yet available to the Members of the Senate. I am not unmindful of the fact that yesterday the Senate took up for consideration the wool bill, without having before it the printed record of the hearings. It did so after it was stated on the floor that the matter had been fully and adequately covered in extensive hearings held over a period of years, with which the membership of the Senate was largely familiar; and it also appeared that there had been no order to print the hearings on the wool bill this year. However, such is not the case in the present instance.

The foreign contract-labor program was a war-emergency measure which began in 1943, and has continued 4 years. The law provided that it should terminate at the expiration of 6 months after the end of hostilities. Consequently it will go out of existence on June 30 of the present year unless it is extended by Congress. The question is whether the foreign contract-labor law should be continued in peacetime, and no previous hearings of the Senate can possibly shed any light on that question.

Furthermore, Mr. President, minority views have been prepared by three members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which considered the bill. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the ranking minority member of the committee, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], and I, myself, joined in the minority views. The minority views have not yet been printed, and therefore are not available for consideration by Members of the Senate.

What good is it for one of the committees of this body to conduct long hearings, taking up the time of Senators and witnesses, and why should Senators take the time and trouble to prepare minority views, if the Senate is going to rush into consideration of a bill before either the report of the hearings or the minority views are before Senators or can, in the nature of the case, be made available?

This body prides itself on being the greatest deliberative body in the world. Certainly its power and prestige were never higher than today, when the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made a memorable speech on this floor. Surely the Senate is too zealous to maintain its reputation for careful and informed action to be willing to rush into the consideration of a measure, Mr. President, of vital importance, without Senators having had an opportunity to read the report of the hearings, or the minority views of three members of the committee to which it had been referred.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is a matter of vital concern to the American people and to their representatives. My reasons for that statement are, first, that this is the first time, except during a war emergency, when the question of authorizing the importation of foreign contract labor into the United States has come before the Senate. We protect our American labor with tariff walls. If we are to import foreign contract labor to compete with the American workman in canneries, in citrus orchards, or in sugar beet fields and refineries, are we willing to import labor to work in automobile factories, garment factories, steel works, and elsewhere in our industrial life?

Mr. President, involved in this bill is a principle of far-reaching implication which should not lightly be considered by the American people or their representatives. There is already evidence of an oversupply of labor in the over-all picture. If Senators want the facts, let them read the excellent statement and brief filed on behalf of the CIO at the hearings.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is there anything in that statement which shows that there is an oversupply of beet-field labor?

Mr. KEM. There is a great deal that shows an oversupply of labor in different parts of the United States, particularly in the State of California. I should be glad to read some of the evidence to the

Senate, if the Senator would like to have me do so. I plan to do so in the event the motion of the Senator from Vermont shall be sustained and the Senate shall proceed to consider the bill on its merits.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If we were importing labor which would compete, in the actual sense, with our own labor, I should be in hearty accord with the sentiments which the distinguished Senator has expressed.

Mr. KEM. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there can be no question of that, on the record made in this case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I may say so to the distinguished Senator from Missouri, having lived in a beet-sugar State for a long time, I have seen again and again a surplus of general labor and an acute shortage of labor in the beet fields which could be remedied only by imported labor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that is the "stoop" labor argument. That condition will be with us for a long time to come. It will exist next year, it will exist the year after, and the year after that. There is an indisposition on the part of the native-born American to do labor of that kind; but the record shows that the development of mechanization has overcome that, and that one American laborer, with the proper kind of mechanical equipment, can go into the sugar-beet fields and do more in less time than a much larger number of imported foreign contract laborers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. As I understand, the bill of which the Senator is speaking is a war measure, which did not go into effect until—when?

Mr. KEM. It went into effect in 1943. It has been in existence for 4 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have been very much interested in the statement of the Senator from Colorado, and with the permission of the able Senator from Missouri, I should like to ask what was done with respect to the supply of labor in the beet fields prior to 1943. May I ask the able Senator from Colorado on that point?

Mr. KEM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it has been customary for many years to import foreign labor for work in the beet fields. Is the Senator directing his question to the intervention of the Government in that matter?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; if it was done prior to 1943—why, then, was the act brought into force in 1943, and why is the extension of this act necessary if prior to 1943 such labor was available in the beet fields?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may answer?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. During the war, the Government set up production goals for beet sugar and other crops, and some exist at present. The Government had a direct interest in the stimulation of the crops which were subject to those goals. Beet sugar was one of them. In view of

that fact, it was felt warrantable for the Government to intervene to aid in putting the necessary labor at the places where the labor was needed.

The Government now is setting beet-sugar goals, and there is dire national need of increased beet-sugar acreage. The Government again has a direct interest in rendering service to those who it expects will produce the goals.

My information from Colorado is that farmers are withholding the planting of crops awaiting the outcome of action in the Senate on this subject. That is a fact. We are dealing with facts. My question is whether we want to get the kind of labor we have had in the past, or whether we want to abandon the sugar-beet crop.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that we are all dealing with facts. We are trying to look at this very realistically, to "look the horse directly in the mouth."

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, if I may make one more observation, I should like to confirm what the distinguished Senator from Missouri has said about the growth of mechanization in beet production. When I was in the beet fields last fall, practically every beet farmer with whom I came in contact told me that the machines then operating were doing a very good job, and that we could expect, over a reasonable period of time, to get rid of a substantial part of our problem. But we have not yet reached that point.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado if I understood him correctly to say that foreign contract labor was brought into his State prior to the Enabling Act of 1943.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. How was it brought in? Under what law?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The private contractors themselves brought in foreign labor.

Mr. KEM. How did they get the foreign laborers through the Immigration Service?

Mr. MILLIKIN. They went down into Mexico and made contracts to import the labor, and it was imported, but there was a great amount of dissatisfaction about it, because it was claimed that the labor that came in was not properly treated, in some instances, after it got here, and there was a considerable opinion that it would be better to have Government regulation of the matter.

Mr. KEM. If it was done prior to 1943, is there any reason why it cannot be done now?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Is the Senator talking about "right now"?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The answer to "right now" is that, in fact, we are at a point where we cannot retrace the steps necessary to assemble the labor in Mexico and bring it in on an entirely different basis. We have got to know right now whether we are going to get the labor. We have got to know right now whether we are going to take advantage of the actions which the Department of Agriculture has taken in Mexico to render this labor available; which I understand have been successful. I understand

that there are trainloads of laborers ready to be brought in. Now, to strike that all down, and to say that it must be started over on a different approach, might solve the problem next year, but it will not solve it this year, I suggest.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President—

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should prefer not to yield further. I should like to complete my remarks on the motion.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri decline to yield?

Mr. KEM. I prefer not to yield at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEM. I should like to complete my remarks, Mr. President, on the motion. If the motion is sustained, then I shall expect to discuss the subject on the merits, and I shall be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota at that time.

I should like to say, in reply to the suggestion by the Senator from Colorado, that no reasons appears to me why what has been done along this line during the past few years could not now be done by the private individuals who are engaged in this business; in other words, they could take over, through their associations, just where the Government leaves off.

Furthermore, I should like to suggest to the Senator that if the Government is to handle the matter, then the foreign contract labor ought to be brought in at the expense of the employer who uses the labor. The evidence is that it costs the Government about \$200 for each laborer brought in—that is, \$200 for the season—and he works a little less than 100 days during the season. In other words, the Government pays about \$2 a day for each laborer brought in, for the actual time he works in the fields.

That brings me, Mr. President, to the second reason why I think this question is vital. It is because this is the first time, to my knowledge, the question of granting a direct subsidy has come before the Senate for decision, as the Senate is presently constituted.

On March 15 of this year a Pittsburgh man wrote an open letter to Congress, in which he said that he was astonished to find that his Federal taxes for the present year, payable on March 15, were 37 times as great as his State, county, and city taxes. He said, "A comparatively small amount, one-thirty-seventh of the amount of my Federal taxes, is paid for all school facilities, all police protection, sanitary service, including street cleaning and garbage collection."

On reason for the astonishment of this Pittsburgh citizen at the size of the Federal taxes is the payment of subsidies by the Federal Government. He will continue to be astonished so long as Federal subsidies and similar expenditures are authorized by Congress.

I know, Mr. President, in view of the matters presently before Congress, that there is no time for us to wander in the wonderland of Federal subsidies. One

difficulty of such an adventure is that none of the departments of the Government agree as to what a subsidy is. The Bureau of the Budget, on request by the senior Senator from Virginia, has worked out a list of 31 subsidies. There are about 13 different ways of paying the subsidies. The purpose of some is to keep prices up; the purpose of others is to keep prices down; but the purpose they all have in common is to siphon money from the Treasury of the United States.

Subsidies, Mr. President, are part and parcel of the system by which Hitler undermined the self-reliance and destroyed the personal initiative of the German people. Surely we should not today make such an eventful decision as we are called upon to make, without a thorough examination of the facts, and a careful weighing of the arguments pro and con. Obviously this cannot be done without the report of the hearings, and without the views of the minority of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope that the motion to consider Senate bill 2102 today will not prevail.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I think that we are all somewhat confused on this question. It has been referred to as a subsidy, it has been referred to as an expenditure on the part of the Federal Government to import foreign labor. I do not believe it is either one. It is a question of concentrating in the harvest fields at the time when the harvesting must be done in the various sections of the Nation available workers from other areas where they may not be needed. Prior to the war, there were workers on the Pacific coast who were ready to engage in harvesting in the citrus area. Prior to the war there were workers in the Southwest at the time when sugar beets were to be harvested. Prior to the war there were workers in the Midwest, ready to help in harvesting green peas and sweet corn and sugar beets, as they came on in season. The war dislocated all that. The war took the youth of the Nation into the Army. They are coming back today and availing themselves of the GI educational program in many instances and are not available in the rural areas for farm work. The war took our young men away to the factory, and those youths have not returned. The fact of the matter is, the greatest part of this service is to concentrate workers in the areas in which they are available, and transport them to areas where the crops are ready to be harvested.

Like the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], if I thought this were a subsidy to the farmer, I should be opposed to it. Like the Senator from Missouri, if I thought it was designed to import foreign workers, I should be against it. It is for the purpose of assuring ourselves, at a time when we need food more acutely than in any prewar year. We must have certainty, and the assurance that the harvest will be properly conducted in season. The other great question is, that we must conserve the food in order to prevent prices from rising any

higher than they are at the present time.

So I say, Mr. President, that this program should be permitted to continue another 6 months, and the farmer must know now that it is to be continued, because we are in the midst of the planting season. Either we must designate acres to the crop which is going to require all this extra labor, or we will designate our acres to the type of crop of which we have a surplus planted at the present time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. Certainly.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not true that in our more than a week of hearings the only opposition to the bill was from the rather pretty CIO girl from California? Her testimony was not very pertinent to the bill, but those seeking enlightenment on the opposition to it will find practically nothing in opposition in the entire hearings, except the testimony given by that CIO representative.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have one thing more to say and that is that the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers for peak production of certain crops this year, and the Department of Agriculture has estimated that it will require 55,000 additional workers to harvest the crop which the Department of Agriculture has asked the American farmers to produce. They are going to ask for \$10,000,000 with which to administer this program. About \$4,500,000 of it will be used in recruiting domestic labor in one section of the country for the harvesting in other areas. The other \$5,500,000 dollars will be used in recruiting and importing foreign labor to help harvest the peak load which is now being demanded of the American farmers. I think these figures are real enough so that we may accept them. This matter of farm labor has been before the Senate for 4 years now. I think all the old Members of the Senate are entirely familiar with it. I presume that most of the new Members are also.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I think I might inject an economy note into this debate. In many of the States during the past year there has been an overproduction of potatoes, I think approximately 100,000,000 bushels, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Department of Agriculture have spent upwards of \$75,000,000 to support the potato prices at 90 percent of parity and to remove surpluses from normal channels of trade. The proposal before us now would have the effect of reducing the potato acreage in many of the Western States and would encourage a larger production of sugar beets. To that extent this labor program will minimize any potential problem resulting from an overproduction of potatoes during the current crop year. Unless this foreign labor is made available I am fearful that we will accentuate the problem and that more potatoes will be produced than we have during the past year, instead of producing more sugar

beets. This would help to alleviate the shortage of sugar which has existed in this country for several years.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. If the farmer cannot secure labor for the hand work, to grow the crops which require hand labor, he will devote his land to the production of crops which can be grown with what machinery he may have on hand or which he may be able to obtain.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont to proceed to the consideration of House bill 2102.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such act, shall be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within 30 days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until 6 months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or December 31, 1947, whichever is the earlier." Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensations laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Inasmuch as this is an amendment which strikes out and inserts, the amendment itself is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment:

Provided, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, very briefly this amendment provides that foreign laborers who are already in the country and are at work in the agricultural field, when they finish the particular work in which they are engaged will not have to be shipped out of the country and then reimported. For instance, in my State—and the same situation prevails in a great many other States—when foreign labor comes into our country for the purpose of harvesting a certain crop, as soon as that crop is harvested they must leave, although there may be another crop which must be harvested perhaps 5 or 10 or 20 miles away, yet under the existing regulations when the workers have completed harvesting the crop on which they were engaged it is necessary to ship them 500 miles down to the Mexican border, and then to reimport them and bring them back perhaps within 10 miles of the point at which they were previously working. My amendment will eliminate the necessity for doing that. To that extent I believe it is an economy measure. It provides the necessary safeguards of the posting of a bond with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and it requires that the conditions of employment be satisfactory to the Mexican Government as well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is not intended by the Senator's amendment, is it, that it shall remain in effect longer than the rest of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No. It will expire with the other provisions of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is a temporary measure just as is the main bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Was this amendment proposed in the committee?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; the amendment was not proposed in the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment was proposed by the Senator from California yesterday. I have read the amendment. It has not been acted upon by the committee. But after reading the amendment, and reserving the right to be mistaken, I can see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

(c) No worker recruited in a foreign country under the provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall be employed by any employer after June 30, 1947, unless such employer shall agree to pay to the United States for each day of such employment an amount equal to the average cost per worker to the United States, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the recruitment and transportation of, and of the services and assistance furnished to, all such workers under such act, divided by the average number of days of employment of all such workers within the United States under such act, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture. The Secretary is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to provide for the collection of amounts payable by employers under this subsection. All such amounts collected shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the purpose of the amendment is obvious. It is designed to prorate among employers of contract labor the cost to the Government of the United States of bringing the labor into this country and taking it back again when the time of employment is over.

I shall not trespass long on the time of the Senate. I shall devote such time as I feel at liberty to take to reading certain portions of the testimony and evidence which would be available to Members of the Senate if they had copies of the hearings on their desks and had an opportunity to read them before considering the bill.

The principal argument advanced by the proponents of the bill is that there is a crying need for labor throughout the United States. Mr. President, the desire is not for labor, but for cheap labor. That is what is prompting the demand for the bill. It comes from those who want to employ labor at rates below the market price for the available labor supply.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. THYE. The provisions of the bill make it mandatory that the employer pay the prevailing wage in the community for such labor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the argument has been made that there is no "stoop" labor available in certain communities, and that the American laborer does not want to work at the price that is offered him. It seems to me that the argument answers itself.

After the hearings on the bill were completed two very important incidents occurred. One was the passage of the act eliminating the ceiling price on sugar after October 31 of this year. In other words, sugar produced in the present crop will be sold in the open market, and in all probability the price will be much higher than the presently prevailing price. What a travesty it will be if that sugar is produced by labor subsidized from the Treasury of the United States, and sold to the housewife at from 20 to 50 cents a pound.

There is no question that the bill is a subsidy. The money is obtained, Mr. President, from you and from me under the taxing power of the United States, and it is to be distributed under the War Emergency Act, to certain producers throughout the United States. The question is whether money obtained under the taxing power of the United States should be distributed to producers when the war emergency has ceased.

There has been considerable said as to the situation in various States. The second incident of importance which occurred after the hearings were completed, or which came to our attention after they were completed, was the arrival of a report from the California Farm Research and Legislative Committee, dated March 15, 1947. The address of the committee is 740 Hilmer Street, Santa Clara, Calif. The report is issued under the name of Mrs. Grace McDonald, executive secretary. I should like to read the entire report, but I shall not do so. I shall read one brief excerpt, which is very much to the point:

Efforts of certain California Congressmen to stampe for the importation program are deplorable in the face of the growing unemployment situation in California today. During the year 1946 it is estimated that some 5,000,000 persons entered California by car. Of this number from 250,000 to 500,000 were potential farm workers and their families. As of March 1 there were some 36,000 applicants filing with the California Farm Labor Office, Agricultural Extension Service, for jobs which could not be filled. These applicants are absolutely without economic resources. They have no social security benefits to fall back upon, and probably there is very little in the way of income from other members of their families.

A recent lay-off of 500 cannery and packing-house workers in Santa Clara County, due to curtailment of operations in anticipation of lower consumer demand is a case in point. Farm job seekers are offering to work for their food, in many instances. If the situation reflects conditions in the Middle West and South, California may well face a new Grapes of Wrath in migration, with a new rural housing and health crisis. To superimpose a farm labor importation program on this unstable social structure with critical potential racial and national tensions, would be dynamite.

Something has been said about the "stoop" labor argument. Of course, that argument can be made next year and the year after. If we are to be influenced by it, we shall be influenced by it next year and the year after, as much as we would be today.

In that connection a very interesting statement was made by Representative PACE in the hearings on the bill before

the House committee. I quote from the statement of Representative PACE:

I am sure you realize that the farms of this country are being mechanized just as rapidly as the labor unions will permit them to be and we can buy the farm machinery. Within a period of 5 or 10 years there will be between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000 surplus people on the farms of this Nation, for the very simple reason that they will not be needed.

Members of this committee had an opportunity during the fall to visit different sections of the country and saw many mechanized farms in operation. I had an opportunity to visit the High Plains of Texas, where one man cultivates 200 acres of cotton, where I rode for 4 long days and I did not see a mule and I did not see a horse. You look across the plains and you can see a dust cloud, and when you get close you see 3, 5, or 10 tractors drawing 8-, 10-, or 12-row cultivators. Now that is going on all over the country. The population on the farms during the war went down to 25,000,000 and it is probably up to 26,000,000 now. I think one of the most serious problems facing the Nation is going to be the surplus people on the farms of the Nation because of this mechanization, which will further aggravate the concentration of our population in the extremities.

It strikes me as strange that you should be here now, long after the termination of hostilities, trying to bring in more foreign people to work on the farms when we now have, including the unemployment of veterans, thousands of unemployed among our civilian population, in the total running into millions of people who are without employment; and with this serious problem facing us, what are we going to do with the surplus people on the farms of this Nation in the near future? I don't understand why we should be called upon to give our time in bringing in more foreign workmen.

I can understand why the farmers like it because the Federal Government goes and gets the foreign workers in Mexico, Puerto Rico, the Bahamas, and other places and brings them in, puts them down at the farmer's door, provides a place for them to live, provides medical attention, doctors' expenses, burial if they should die, supports the members of their family, and provides them food; and when the crop is harvested takes them somewhere else. I think every farmer would like to have that service, but my information is that it is enjoyed by only a handful of what we call the big operators.

Mr. President, that brings me to the second point, and that is that the small-scale American farmer who works with his hands is subjected by this program to unfair competition by granting to the employer of foreign contract labor a subsidy which the small-scale American farmer does not get. Of course, it is an economic law that every producer is in competition with every other producer of the same commodity. It is likewise an economic law that every worker is in competition with every other worker in the same field of business. How can it be argued that bringing in foreign contract labor does not affect the supply of labor in the United States? If it affects the supply of labor, does it not result in lowering the wage scale? In that connection, the testimony of the representative of the CIO who appeared before the committee has been referred to. I have the statement before me now, and I wish I felt justified in reading it at length—which I shall not do. I think

any Senator who is interested in it and who examines it will come to the conclusion that it is a well-considered, temperate, intelligent statement of a highly intelligent person. That witness was Miss Elizabeth Sasuly. She is the Washington representative of the Food, Tobacco, Agricultural, and Allied Workers' Union, an affiliate of the CIO. She pointed out:

I should like to point out to begin with that our organization supported this program during the war. We supported it in spite of the fact that we felt there had been no adequate efforts made to mobilize domestic farm labor within the country for war-food production. Even at the peak of the very real farm-labor shortage, which did exist in some areas during the war, there were still many agricultural workers, particularly in certain regions of the South, who were making very low wages. There was a surplus supply of workers who, if there had been an over-all program, could have been brought into the areas where there were real shortages.

Then she discussed the fact that the States in which recently there has been the loudest demand for imported labor are California and Arizona, and she stated that the reasons are very simple. She said:

They have been trying to create a surplus pool of labor so as to depress wages.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not pretend to know the conditions in all the places of which the lady speaks; but during the war, in order to harvest our sugar beets, in Colorado we closed the high schools and got children out of the schools to help in that work. We closed the stores in the beet-sugar towns so that the businessmen could help in that work. That, it seems to me, utterly refutes the argument as to surplus labor, at least insofar as my own State is concerned.

Mr. KEM. I take it that the witness was not speaking of the State of Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am sure she would not have been. Otherwise, although I would not say the lady was "talking through her hat," I would say that if she made such a statement in referring to Colorado, she did not know what she was talking about.

Mr. KEM. I take it that the Senator from Colorado, with his customary gallantry, will give her the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If she was "talking through her hat," I am sure it must have been a very attractive hat. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Following the Senator's chain of thought as to the vast number of unemployed persons in certain areas of the Nation, I wish to ask the Senator whether he agrees that such an Employment Service is necessary, in view of the fact that in certain areas there are unemployed persons seeking employment which they cannot find. Also, if we have the Employment Service which the bill provides, does not the Senator agree that

that type of service would bring an unemployed person to the job which is waiting and crying for a worker who will perform it? That is why I support this measure, in the present emergency and dire need for abundant food production. I support it in order that the worker may find the job which needs a worker.

Mr. KEM. I take it from what the Senator from Minnesota says that he will support my amendment which, in turn, will pass the cost to the Government over to the employer of the labor, so that the Government will not be out of pocket as a result of the operation, but the cost will be borne by the producer and, in turn, passed on to the consumer, where, under the American free-enterprise system, it belongs. Am I correct in that assumption? I ask the Senator from Minnesota that question.

Mr. THYE. I think this is the question: If in Kansas City there are 500 unemployed persons, and if in California or in Colorado there is sugar-beet acreage ready for the harvest, or a citrus crop ready for harvest, should we expect the producer to assume the responsibility of taking such unemployed persons from Kansas City and paying their transportation to the harvest field?

Mr. KEM. I am afraid that I have failed, as I often do, to make myself clear.

Mr. THYE. I understood the Senator's question to be primarily that.

Mr. KEM. My question was whether the Senator would support an amendment to pass the cost of this service on to the producer who, in turn, could pass it to the consumer, where, under the American system of free enterprise, it belongs.

Mr. THYE. I still go back to the same question, namely, whether it is the Government's responsibility to transport unemployed people from Kansas City to the harvest fields where the jobs are waiting for them.

Mr. KEM. I do not want to pursue the question unduly, but I desire to clear it up as far as possible.

Mr. THYE. I cannot answer the Senator's question any more clearly than I have.

Mr. KEM. Would the Senator care to answer it "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. THYE. The question is so simple: If in Kansas City there are 500 unemployed people, and if in Colorado the sugar producers are ready to harvest their beet-sugar crop and cannot get help, should the producers in Colorado pay the cost of transporting the unemployed people from Kansas City, when the Government itself would have to pay unemployment compensation to those persons if they did not find jobs?

Mr. KEM. The able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota does not state the question as I see it. The question is this: If there is available labor in Vera Cruz or in Barbados or in the Bahamas, outside the tariff wall of the United States, and it becomes advisable, in the opinion of the Congress, to import it into the United States to compete with free American workers, who shall pay the cost of bringing the workers to the place in the United States where they are needed, and the cost of providing them

with subsistence and medical care, and the cost of eventually returning them whence they came? Shall it be paid by the producer who employs the workers or shall it be paid out of the Treasury of the United States? That is the question. It is not a question of transporting labor from Kansas City to Colorado. It is a question of bringing the labor from Vera Cruz or the Bahamas or Puerto to Colorado.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The question has become so much broader since the last statement of the Senator from Missouri that it would require a much different approach in order to reply. But, in the event the food situation were such that every pound of food which could be produced was absolutely needed, and if we could not afford to lose any of it as a result of the lack of help to do the harvesting, and if then it were a known fact that the food would go to waste because of the lack of adequate help—regardless of whether the area concerned were in California or in Colorado—in that event, if this employment service were established, the Federal Government would have the responsibility of bringing the necessary available help, whether it were brought from Kansas City or from Philadelphia or from some foreign country, in order to salvage the food which has already been mentioned in this debate, and thus prevent the danger of having the price of sugar increase after October 31. Mr. President, we must not permit sugar to increase in price because of the lack of acreage of sugar beets or a lack of the labor needed to grow the sugar beets at that time of the year.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the question to which I am addressing myself is this: Who shall pay the expense of bringing the labor into the United States from foreign countries?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to suggest that if the farmer wants the labor badly enough, and if he has no choice, there is no question as to who will pay the expense. But if the farmer is trying to accommodate himself to a Government program, which is the case insofar as sugar is concerned, and if the Government primarily wishes to have the acreage of sugar beets increased, and if the farmer has a choice as to the crops which he may plant, then the question is entirely different. It is the latter case which poses the question. The Government is trying to get the farmer to plant increased sugar-beet acreage. The farmer has half a dozen crops which he can plant with family labor or with nearby labor. When we suggest to the farmer that he pay his share of the cost of bringing in labor from Mexico, for instance, he says, "Why should I do that? I will plant something else, and will use my family or will use village labor."

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether he believes that with the opportunity held out to the producer to sell his sugar at a scarcity price in a free market, there will be very much difficulty in getting him to plant sugar beets.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the answer to that question is, so far as my own State is concerned, that I am besieged by anxious inquiries about what is going to happen here; and the statement is frequently made by responsible people that if the Congress does not enact this legislation, they will not plant sugar beets.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the able Senator from Colorado whether in his years of service in the Senate he has not heard many similar threats from people who wanted advantageous legislation enacted by this body and by the House of Representatives.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would not preclude the possibility that someone who wants advantageous legislation enacted will ask for it. But I am simply stating that so far as my own State is concerned and so far as our sugar-beet labor problem is concerned, the information is incontrovertible, so far as the record of information which I have in my office is concerned, that they will not plant sugar beets unless they have the assurance of sufficient labor, and that if they were compelled to do the thing the Senator from Missouri wishes them to do, they would not accept that alternative and they would not plant. That is the situation.

Mr. KEM. Of course, I might suggest to the Senator from Colorado the adage that mere assertion is nugatory; and if I know the Senator from Colorado well, I do not believe he is the sort of man whose judgment would be influenced by a threat.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the Senator that during the war the farmers in my State and, I think, in the other sugar-beet States had the same choice; and because of the uncertainty in regard to the labor supply and because of the very problems that we are now considering, they did not meet their sugar-beet quotas; and that is one of the reasons why we have a sugar shortage in this country.

Mr. KEM. While the Senator from Colorado is on his feet, I should like to ask him whether he believes that an entirely different question is involved since the passage of the law lifting the controls on sugar, as compared with the question which was involved at the time of the hearings on this bill, when the sugar producer was asking for pecuniary assistance from the Government because, as he said, he was selling at a ceiling price in a rigged market.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest to the distinguished Senator that the need for the enactment of this bill has been accentuated by the enactment of the legislation to which he has just referred. Controls will be removed at the end of October. Unless we have a plentiful supply of sugar in October, we shall have a disastrous price rise. This temporary legislation will enable us to get the sugar

crops planted, and will aid in alleviating that situation, if it should occur.

Mr. KEM. I believe that any farmer who has acreage available for raising sugar and has the necessary knowledge and equipment to plant it, with the very alluring prospect of being able to sell it in a scarcity market with no ceiling price, will avail himself of that opportunity and take his chance with the labor supply.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation, as distinguished from a question?

Mr. KEM. Certainly.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator frequently has referred to this matter as a subsidy. I suppose a rather broad definition of the term "subsidy" can be given. I suggest that the present proposal is, in fact, a service which the Government offers in connection with a program which the Government proposes. How does it differ in real essence from the service the Government offers, and from which the farmer benefits, when a good Federal-aid highway is built through a State? How does it differ in real substance from the benefit which a shipowner or a port city receives when a harbor is improved? How can it be distinguished from any one of a hundred services which the Government provides in order to give background help, in assistance of the general public welfare, in hundreds of different directions? Are we not going too far when we call this a subsidy, when it is not, in fact, something which goes directly to the farmer, but merely aids him in this indirect way in a Government program?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado has invited me to wander in the wonderland of Federal subsidies, which I said earlier in the afternoon was a pleasure which I would deny myself.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If I withdraw my remarks regarding the definition of "subsidy," will the Senator from Missouri refrain from wandering? [Laughter.]

Mr. KEM. I shall not agree to do that entirely, Mr. President, because the prospect is so alluring. I have had an invitation which I did not expect to receive.

Mr. President, as I said earlier in the afternoon, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] some time ago asked the Bureau of the Budget for a statement of the subsidies now being paid by the Federal Government. The Bureau of the Budget replied that it was difficult to do so because no two departments agreed as to what were and were not subsidies. However, finally the Bureau of the Budget submitted a list of 31 subsidies. It said there were 13 different ways of paying those subsidies.

I think the proposal now before us is probably as direct a subsidy as any we are likely to find. It is to be paid directly for the transportation, subsistence, and medical care for such foreign laborers who are brought into the United States from foreign countries and are put to work in canneries and fields and groves in the United States.

The President's budget for the year ending June 30 last identified subsidies as totaling \$2,500,000,000. The figure dropped to \$718,000,000 for the current 12 months, and the President's budget for the ensuing 12 months' period provides for \$442,000,000.

Mr. President, this is the first time, so far as I know, when the question of whether we are going along with the subsidy program has come before the Senate for decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Assuming, for the purpose of the argument only, that this is a subsidy, does the Senator believe that we should raise that enormous subject and try to reach a decision on it in connection with this temporary legislation?

Mr. KEM. I believe that the way to resume is to resume. The way to stop subsidies is to stop them, to consider the first one that comes up and lop it off, and then continue the process until we return to the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Missouri does not wish to be unfair to anyone, and I notice that he has given great thought to problems of some portions of the Nation. But I wonder if he has given thought to the situation I now present to him.

There are in my State of Florida large additional plantings, not of beets for sugar, but of cane for sugar. Those plantings were invited by the Department of Agriculture because of the shortage of sugar. The plantings were made before the recent legislation to which the Senator referred, because it takes considerably more than a year to bring the planted cane to the stage where it can be harvested for sugar.

There is no pool of trained sugarcane field operators available in this Nation, and our people, if they are to be at all assisted in the effort which they are making at the invitation of the Government to help meet the sugar shortage, must be helped during the next season by workers from Jamaica, or some like place.

I wondered if the Senator had thought of that situation, and how he would feel about the withdrawal from those people of the opportunity to import labor? They have had no previous experience in bringing in labor from that field, because there had been no need to bring them in prior to the war; but they had to step up production because of the war, by invitation of the Government. Would the Senator feel that it is fair, with the cane already planted, coming toward the time when it must be gathered next fall and winter, to withhold from those people access to the only pool of labor where they can find trained persons who are accustomed to that particular type of work? I am asking the Senator the question because I know he wants to be fair.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the suggestion, and I am glad to have the question.

Of course, I defer to the knowledge of the Senator from Florida as to labor conditions in his own State. However, I would invite his attention to the testimony of the representative of the CIO before our committee on that subject. She had a good deal to say about the conditions in the State of Florida. She said, as appears on page 192 of the testimony:

For example, in Florida in 1942, I believe it was, several thousand Bahaman workers were brought in at a time when our people right there on the spot in Florida were available for work. There were literally thousands of agricultural workers within the State itself who were available for work. However, in spite of that, we did support most aspects of the program during the war, although we did oppose the importation of Bahamans I have just described, but we cannot see any excuse for continuing the program at the present time as a peacetime measure.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I wish to complete my answer to the point which the Senator raised, and then I will yield.

I do not think it is necessary to pass the bill as it is in order to have the advantage of the Mexican labor, or the Barbados labor, or whatever is used in Florida.

In the first place, the Senator from Colorado has told us that prior to the wartime measure foreign labor was brought into his part of the country under a free-enterprise system, by free agencies. If we want to do that now, there is no reason why the Government Employment Service or the State employment services cannot assist in that work. There is no reason why Congress cannot pass an enabling law which will make an exception of the present laws which have been on our statute books for many years against the importation of foreign contract labor. So that if the need is present, and if it cannot be supplied by the market, I do not think there is any reason for saying we have to take this bill "as is" in order to meet the situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator is confusing the issue a little by referring to the Bahaman labor. That has no relation at all to sugarcane fields. The Bahaman labor was imported from just across the Gulf stream from our southeastern shore, about 90 miles, to meet the need for workers in general vegetable production, and then they moved on up the seaboard, going as far as Connecticut, I believe. The sugarcane labor comes only from Jamaica, because that is where there are heavy sugarcane plantings.

As to the Bahaman importation—so as to keep the record straight, because I know the Senator wants it kept straight, and not finding fault with the witness, because I do not know her—I know that in the year in question we called for help from States as far off as Missouri, the fine State from which the Senator comes, and Maryland, and imported laborers to the number of many thousands, and still

we were short, and had then to ask the Federal Government to help us by securing, through international arrangement, the importation of Bahamans.

Particularly in view of the heavy sugarcane plantings made at the Government's request, which can be utilized adequately only through the importation of Jamaican labor, I do not believe the continuance of the law for 6 months, or 7 months, which would make that possible, should be turned down by the Senate. I believe it is a fair request.

I notice that the Secretary of Agriculture prefers that the extension be up until the end of June 1948, but for some reason in the committee the time was cut down. Is that correct, I ask the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator will agree with me that the date of January 1 was arrived at as a compromise date for the ending of the farm-labor program, with an additional 30 days in which to get the workers from the beet factories back to their homes.

Mr. KEM. I think it was a compromise with the idea of some other persons. It was adopted by the majority of the committee, and not agreed to by the minority.

Mr. AIKEN. It was agreed to by the majority of the committee.

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was one of those who did not look with too much favor upon our bringing foreign labor into this country to compete with American working men and working women unless there was an absolute necessity for it. There were some who thought the period should be extended beyond the 6 months, and 1 month for liquidation. There was a compromise of views. Some of us felt it should be extended as a permanent policy. It never was intended as a permanent policy. It was an emergency policy. It did great good during the war. Without this policy untold quantities of foodstuffs and agricultural commodities would have been wasted in the fields or never have been planted or harvested at all. But at the same time we felt that it was probably desirable that the program be continued for a limited time, so that some additional harvests might be assured, and that was the basis of the compromise of 6 months with 1 month for liquidation.

I should like to say to my able friend from Missouri that while some of us did not want it extended permanently or for a long period of time, we heartily agreed to this limited extension and it would be a great disservice I think to the agriculturalists of this country if the program were not carried out as the committee has recommended.

Mr. KEM. I will say that the Senator from Florida made a similar statement before the committee at the time the bill was being heard.

I desire to make two more points, Mr. President, and then I shall be through.

Much has been said about the difficulties in which the beet-sugar producers find themselves. I am not shedding any crocodile tears for them, and I will tell the Senate why. Sugar beets are generally sold under a prearranged contract at a figure to be determined. The contract generally provides the basis paid to the farmers, which shall be determined by the amount the refiner receives from the sale of sugar. Most of the contracts provide for a definite percentage of the return, usually around 50 percent.

The sugar content of beets varies materially, but generally speaking 1 ton of beets yields 300 pounds of sugar.

Following are the OPA ceiling prices on beet sugar at the refinery:

	Per hundredweight
1945 -----	\$5.40
1946:	
Feb. 10 -----	5.90
Feb. 24 -----	6.00
Sept. 18 -----	7.50
Nov. 20 -----	7.90
1947:	
Jan. 18 -----	8.10
Mar. 30 -----	8.15

In other words, the refiner is already receiving 50 percent more for beet sugar than the 1945 price.

In regard to the support price for sugar beets, in 1945, it was \$12.50 per ton; in 1946, \$13.50 per ton; and in 1947, it is estimated it will be \$14.50 per ton.

The farmer's full price for 1946 has not yet been determined. The contract between the refiners and the farmers apparently contains a minimum price, but the actual figure is not determined until the beets are harvested and refined, and the product sold. So that if the high prices which are anticipated for the refined product are attained this year, the beet-sugar producer will do very well indeed. He will need no relief from the Government.

The average production of beets is 12.41 tons per acre. If the farmers paid \$2 per day per worker, which is the cost to the Government, it would increase the cost of production about \$10 or less per acre. This is less than \$1 per ton. It will be noted that the 1947 support price is \$2 per ton greater than in 1945, and that the sugar controls will expire October 31, 1947, which is prior to the time the price of the 1947 beet crop will be determined.

If the taxpayers foot the bill for foreign laborers as provided in this bill, and the consumers foot the bill following the removal of sugar ceilings, the public, Mr. President, will pay double. My whole point is that if foreign labor is to be brought into the United States, it ought not to be brought in at the expense of the Federal Government. The cost should be allocated among the producers who avail themselves of it. They in turn can pass it on to the consumer.

I hope that my amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the amendment to the committee amendment, which has been offered by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call attention to a letter from the Secretary of

Agriculture, printed in the report on the pending bill, in which the Secretary of Agriculture strongly favors the enactment of the bill now pending. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 12, 1947.

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
Chairman, House Committee
on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOPE: This is in reply to your request of January 28, 1947, for a report on H. R. 1388, a bill "to provide for continuance of the farm-labor-supply program up to and including June 30, 1948." The bill authorizes the appropriation of "such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance of such program as provided in this act."

Authority and funds for the emergency farm-labor-supply program have been provided to June 30, 1947, through—

Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session—\$26,100,000 for 8 months of 1943;

Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$30,000,000 for calendar year 1944;

Public Law 529, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—\$20,000,000 for calendar year 1945;

Public Law 269, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session—\$25,000,000 for calendar year 1946; and

Public Law 521, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session—\$12,000,000 to June 30, 1947.

Favorable action on H. R. 1388 is recommended in order to give assurance to farmers and other producers of agricultural commodities that the farm-labor-supply program authorized for the first 6 months of the calendar year 1947 will be continued throughout the harvest period when it is even more difficult to obtain adequate supplies of agricultural labor than during the planting season. Such assurance at an early date will stimulate spring plantings necessary to achieve the 1947 production goals which have been continued at wartime levels. The 1947 production goals for sugar and oil crops are even higher than for 1946 and the type of labor brought in under this program has been particularly helpful for these crops. It is anticipated that the supply of agricultural workers available during 1947 will be about the same as during 1946.

Extension of the authority for the farm-labor program, contained in Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, as amended and supplemented, during the first 6 months of the calendar year 1948 will make possible continuation of the farm-labor-supply program during the winter harvest season in certain Southern and Southwestern States. It also provides ample time for the Congress to consider whether any farm-labor program is needed in the postwar years, for the orderly transition from emergency to peacetime activities, and the liquidation of the program during the last 6 months of the 1948 fiscal year.

In extending the program it is necessary that existing facilities continue to be provided for proper housing and feeding of agricultural workers. Those facilities have been made available through permanent and mobile camps. Such facilities are subject to liquidation commencing July 1, 1947, as provided in Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session. In order that the necessary housing will be available through the extended period, the amendment to section 2 (d), Public Law 731, as provided in H. R. 1388 is necessary.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I want to speak for a very few moments on the pending bill as it appears before the Senate. No Member of the Senate is more deeply interested in agriculture than I am. As a member of the Agricultural Committee, I have taken part in all the hearings which have been held on this type of legislation since I entered the Senate. I am deeply interested in agricultural production, but I wonder if the Senate is not somewhat confused about this particular piece of legislation. As at present constituted, the importation of foreign labor into this country is subject to complete termination within a very few months. This matter has been under consideration since 1943. In 1943 \$30,000,000 was appropriated for that purpose; the next year, \$26,000,000; the next year, \$30,000,000; the next year, \$20,000,000; and finally, this year, \$12,000,000.

This bill definitely provides for complete termination of the program within a very few months; I believe, on January 1, 1948. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that 10 or 12 million veterans have returned to their homes during the last few months, and that most of them are available for farm labor. It has been suggested that Mexicans are the only ones available for what is called "stoop" labor.

I remind the Senate that this program, established only in 1943, is to be terminated on January 1, next. But do not overlook the fact that the beet sugar areas, of which my State has one, have been continuing for many years. We have never needed to employ Mexican labor to carry on that type of work. My contention is that our veterans themselves, who have returned home, can do all the farm labor that is needed. So long as we are engaged in an economy program we should terminate this particular program now without continuing it indefinitely. Apparently there are those who think that the fact that we have appropriated money to carry on the program for another year justifies continuing it for still another year, and then for still another year more. If we are going to terminate the program, now is the time to do so.

I suggest that the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri be adopted, and that the bill itself be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I desire to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. I became quite familiar with this program because it originated in the Committee on Appropriations during the war. I recall that last year when the program was extended for 1 year, the proponents of the program of importing farm labor, "stoop" labor, so-called, were put on notice that that was the last extension they were going to receive.

I am inclined to support the bill because I think we made a mistake in cutting off the program on June 30, in the middle of the crop year, instead of on January 1. I think there is some jus-

tification for extending the program to include the current crop season.

There is no question, however, Mr. President, that it is a subsidy for the Government to provide this kind of "stoop" labor which Americans do not seem to want to perform any more. The testimony before our committee was that it cost the Government approximately \$1 per day of work done by these imported laborers to bring them into the country and house them and provide medical services and other expenses involved.

Now that price controls are off all agricultural products except sugar, and they are going off sugar on October 31, I see no reason why the purchaser and the eventual consumer should not pay the cost of this program. As a matter of fact, there was some discussion in the committee last year as to why the users of this labor should not pay the cost instead of the general taxpayer paying it. But as it had been a war program, brought about by the shortage of labor supply during the war, there was some justification during the war for the Government assuming the whole cost. The war has been over for more than a year and a half, and there is no longer any excuse, in my opinion, for the general taxpayer being called upon to pay the cost of this bill.

I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri will be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. Not only would it amount to changing the rules in the last 10 minutes of the game, or in the last few months in which this program is to be continued, but it would be very highly inequitable. Probably between 35 and 40 percent of the laborers who would be used this year are already in this country. They have been brought in at Government expense. Are we going to ask the farmers who have not secured their help yet to pay the cost of bringing in the remainder while those who already have their labor have had it brought in free? Or are we going to hire a great number of bookkeepers to figure out their cost and make a retroactive charge against the farmers who already have the help?

Furthermore, this program is not confined to foreign help. Out of 4,900,000 placements last year, 4,627,000 placements were of men and women and boys and girls recruited within this country. Are we going to say to one farmer on the Eastern Shore of Maryland who needs help to harvest his string beans, "We will recruit help in Washington, D. C., and charge the cost of bringing it across the bay," and perhaps tell the man on the next farm, "We will secure help for you from Jamaica, and let you pay the cost of bringing the workers in from Jamaica"? There is no way of working out that plan equitably, so far as I can see.

We had approximately 5,000,000 placements last year at a cost of \$12,000,000. It will be a little less this year. I say it would not only be impracticable but inequitable as well to attempt to change the rules while we recruit and place the

last 55,000 of these workers who will be required for the harvest in the fall.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish the Senator would make a little clearer his observation that out of some four million-odd placements a certain number of the workers came from outside the country. Will the Senator give us the figures more exactly.

Mr. AIKEN. It was testified before the committee that there were 4,900,000 placements in all. That means that the same workman was placed more than once.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I want to know is what proportion of the placements were made, even though they were repetitions, of laborers who were brought in from outside the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. The figures which are given me by the Department of Agriculture show that 4,627,000 of those placements were the men and women and boys and girls recruited within this country and moved from one State to another.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then that would leave approximately how many that were made from labor brought in from outside the United States?

Mr. AIKEN. Approximately 300,000. The greatest number of foreigners employed at one time, as I recall, were 63,000 in the month of September.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can the Senator further break down that figure by telling us how much of the appropriation was used on workers who came from outside the United States and how much of the appropriation was used for workers from within the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. I could probably hunt up those figures, but let me give the Senator the estimate for this year. The Department of Agriculture expects to ask for \$10,000,000. Of this total the domestic part will cost about \$4,469,796. It may be a few cents one way or the other. That would mean that five and one-half million dollars would be for the imported labor and four and a half million dollars for the domestic labor.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many laborers does the Department estimate it will bring in this year from outside the United States?

Mr. AIKEN. The Department estimates that 55,000 laborers will be required to harvest the crops which the Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers of the United States to produce.

Mr. TYDINGS. And that will cost—what was the figure again?

Mr. AIKEN. Five and a half million dollars for the laborers brought in from outside the United States.

Mr. TYDINGS. How much would that average per worker—\$100, would it not?

Mr. AIKEN. It would average \$100.

Mr. TYDINGS. How long are they in the country as a rule from the time they come into Florida and work north with the season?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I have the break-down of the number em-

played month by month. It runs from 63,000 in September down to 25,000 in December for the year 1946.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. My recollection of the testimony before our committee was that the cost was \$200 per worker per season, and, furthermore, that a worker during the season works not to exceed 100 days. So that the cost for the time actually employed in the cannery or in the field or in the refinery to the Government is approximately \$2 a day.

Mr. AIKEN. The fact remains that with a total appropriation of \$12,000,000—and I assume that nearly half of it was used in recruiting labor within the country—the number employed varied from 25,013 in December up to 63,736 for September. That does not figure out at \$200 each, in spite of the testimony.

Mr. KEM. I will ask the Senator if he does not recall that testimony before our committee, that the cost was \$200 per worker?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall the testimony, but I do not question the Senator's word. There was one hearing at which I was not present.

Mr. KEM. I think the record will show that the representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor were agreed that it would cost approximately \$200 per season per laborer.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not find myself out of sympathy with the intention of the amendment primarily, but I believe from some slight knowledge of Washington procedure that it would be almost impracticable to attempt to pass on to each person who employed these workers a proportionate part of the primary cost, or the over-all cost, or whatever formula is adopted.

For example, laborers who come from foreign countries go first to Florida. There they work in the early truck development, orchard picking, and so forth. Then they move up into Georgia, where they pursue similar work. Then they go into South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, and finally they get to Maryland and Delaware, which are in the same vegetable zone, so to speak. Later they go to New Jersey, and still later to New York. It seems to me that we would have to provide such a force to figure out costs that in the end it would probably cost us money. Under that procedure we would have a new bureau firmly established, and we would have more employees than if we did not follow such a system. I have not made any particular examination as to what the cost would be, but knowing Washington as I do, I know that if we write a requirement of this magnitude into the law it will require a great many clerks and calculators to follow the railroad fares and other transportation costs which enter into the problem. While I see merit in the Senator's amendment, I doubt very much whether it would operate as he conceives it. If laborers were coming into

only one State and remaining there, the problem would be simple. Who would pay the costs in connection with a laborer coming from Jamaica to Florida if he were to move from Florida into Georgia? Would the cost of moving from Florida to Georgia be a part of the cost which would be apportioned?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Let me read to the Senator a part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri. None of the imported laborers shall be employed after June 30, "unless such employer shall agree to pay to the United States for each day of such employment an amount equal to the average cost per worker to the United States, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture, of the recruitment and transportation of, and of the services and assistance furnished to, all such workers under such act, divided by the average number of days of employment of all such workers within the United States under such act, as estimated by the Secretary of Agriculture."

It seems to me that that is plain as to what the Secretary shall do. If 55,000 laborers are to be imported, he will figure that it will cost \$200 per worker.

Mr. TYDINGS. From the time they come in until they get back home.

Mr. BALL. On the average, for all of them. Then he will figure what he is going to spend, divided by the number of days worked, and each employer will pay so much per day, as estimated by the Secretary. There is no requirement that the estimate be an accurate reflection of the cost.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Senator's definition, I take it the situation which I have described would not obtain. Instead, this situation would occur: Whether a man employed 100 Jamaicans in Florida or in Charlotte, N. C., or Salisbury, Md., or York, Pa., or wherever it might be, the cost would be the same for each of them during the entire season, and the railroad fare from one point to another would not be added, but the average would prevail all the way through.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. The Secretary would make an average estimate in advance. If the average were a dollar a day, which was the testimony before our committee a year ago, then each employer of this type of labor would contract to pay the Government a dollar a day for each laborer employed.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are agreed on that. Let us pursue the question a little further. Let us suppose that the average cost is \$2 a day. How much salary do these men usually receive?

Mr. BALL. The testimony was that their wages ranged from \$5 to \$7 a day last year. They may be higher this year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then the cost would be between \$7 and \$9 in the aggregate. Is the Senator of the belief that farmers would employ such labor if they had to pay \$9 a day?

Mr. BALL. The Senator from Minnesota is of the opinion that if the employing farmer had to pay the real cost

of importing laborers, he would increase the wages which he paid, and would find that he could obtain much of the necessary labor in the local community, which is what the Senator from Minnesota is after.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me make one concluding remark. In the neighborhood in which I live there is a very large and efficiently operated apple orchard. Last year the owner of that orchard tried to obtain labor from every conceivable source, at very high wages, in my opinion, to help harvest his apple crop. He drew upon women's colleges and almost every other source. The work is clean. He was unable to obtain sufficient labor, and finally got a number of imported workers who had never before picked apples. Strange as it may seem, one cannot simply go up an apple tree and pull off the apple. The imported laborers did not like to leave the ground and go up on ladders. They had not been used to such work. The result was a very low yield per unit of expense. The operations of foreign imported laborers in that particular field were not efficient. The owner would have been nearly as well off financially if he had let his apples rot on the trees rather than pay the wages and other additional expenses which entered into the harvesting of his apple crop.

So there is a point at which such labor will not be employed because of the expense of bringing it into the country and paying the other incidental expenses.

Furthermore, under the rules of the Government, the employer is required to maintain shower baths for the employees. He is required to furnish housing, which is pretty fair housing, if I may describe it. He is subjected to other expenses. After having gone to all that expense and then finding that the labor is inefficient, if the employer must pay an additional penalty of \$2 a day, I am afraid that the help will not be usable. Therefore, we either ought to prohibit such labor from coming into the country or, if it is to come in, we ought to make it possible for the farmer to utilize it 100 percent. Otherwise we shall be cutting down the area of availability of such laborers by imposing penalties.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly what happened in my area. In the first place the employer must pay the prevailing wage, which in my part of the country is approximately \$9 a day and board. In the second place, in these imported workers, the employer has inefficient help. The farmer is very reluctant to employ such labor unless he absolutely has to do so. Last year during our harvesting season the schools and colleges were closed so that the students could aid in the harvest fields. There was no additional help available. Rather than employ imported laborers, the farmers left thousands of acres of grain on the ground. Some of it was harvested in the spring, with tremendous loss of food. If we want less in food crops and high prices, this is one way to accomplish that result.

Mr. TYDINGS. Another thing about imported help from the West Indies is that such laborers do not take kindly to occupations like pitching hay, lifting, and other things to which they are not accustomed. In my part of the country we find that some of them will not do that kind of work. There are certain kinds of harvesting that they will do.

My thought in raising this point is that I should like to see the program placed on a self-sustaining basis. I think there is a good argument in favor of doing so. However, if we are to bring this kind of help into the country we ought to do it with the realization that we are not dealing with American labor, which has a certain know-how in a wide range of agricultural occupations. We are dealing with help which has very little experience in many fields of agricultural work. I believe that in this particular case the amendment, if carried out, would to a large extent defeat its purpose, which is to provide help for the farmer. Under the present arrangement he can use such labor if we do not increase the expense, and he can somehow manage to get along. But I am afraid that if we increase the cost he will refuse to use such labor, and in many cases will let his crops rot in the field. I have seen examples of that attitude in my own county with my own eyes, and I could cite many such instances.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield if I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly subscribe to the statement which the Senator just made, but I wonder if this has occurred to him: Under the amendment, which applies only to labor which may be brought in from another country, whether it be the Bahamas, Jamaica, or Mexico, would not this situation probably result, namely, that a market gardener on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, getting labor coming from offshore, would have to pay a premium of \$1 or \$2 a day, as it has been estimated, whereas his neighbor, getting labor that had been brought there by the Government from unemployed persons in some other area, perhaps hundreds of miles away, would not have to pay such premium, and the result would be that they would not have been treated with any degree of equality by the Federal service in an effort to help them. Would it not result in unequal treatment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe that in the area which the Senator has described it would be a prevalent condition. It might happen in a few cases. But the truth of the matter is that these crops come on with great suddenness. On the Eastern Shore there are some communities which raise celery, cantaloups, watermelons, snap beans, and vegetables of that sort, which come into the harvest period with great suddenness, depending upon the weather. There is not sufficient labor available for the extra work which must be done within a period of a month or less, or it cannot be done at all. It is not like taking cans off a production line which runs all the year round. The crop is ripe on such and such a date, and it

must either be harvested, as in the wheat fields or many other places, or be lost. Perhaps the situation will clear up this year. I should like to dispense with this activity if I could.

I think there is a great deal in what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has said, that if there are people in this country who can do this work we ought to pay them wages and utilize them. This was a war measure. I am not certain in this period of readjustment that we shall have the help necessary to harvest the crops. The thought runs through my mind that if, for one reason or another, a large percentage of the crop is not harvested because help is not available at the moment when the harvest should be made, and it is lost to the food supply of the Nation, I am not sure that it will not cost the users of food, who, after all, are taxpayers, more in dollars and cents than if we carry along one more year of readjustment and then see if we can dispense with it. The policy of importing labor at a time when we have available domestic labor is not a wise one. We should adjust our economy so that our own citizens can be employed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland permit me to bring forward one point?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to.

Mr. THYE. This Employment Service is not solely for the purpose of importing workers from foreign countries; it is a service in every State to concentrate the workers who may be unemployed in their respective communities or States and transport them to an area where there is a job to be done in the harvesting of a food crop. The entire reason why we should give consideration to the continuation of this service for another 6 months is that the various communities have not the normal number of the young people and the workers they had in prewar days. We should not be confused by thinking that it is entirely a service for the purpose of importing foreigners to do a job in this Nation. It utilizes our own people who may be unemployed and helps them to find employment where jobs are waiting for them.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator. As one who has heard most of the testimony for the last 5 or 6 years I freely admit it is a combination of utilizing our own people and bringing in other people. I have served on the committee with my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] for many years when we have had the same problem before us. I fully appreciate that the service is not devoted to bringing in people from the outside; but I say to the Senator that a considerable part of the appropriation herein made was made for the purpose of bringing in people who are what we call off-shore people, and that the percentage of cost which is reflected against them is several times higher than the percentage of cost involved in placing one of our own citizens at a place where he may be employed. It is for that reason that the cost has been shoved upward, and it is for that reason that I am directing my remarks to that par-

ticular phase of the employment matter. As one who served on the committee for 5 years, when we were providing helpers during the war, I am thoroughly familiar with the fact that it involves both off-shore and in-shore employment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. In order to give the Senator an illustration of why farmers will not employ Mexicans when they can hire someone else, I will cite my own experience. During last summer's recess, when I was at home helping on my farm, we were short of help, and the only available help we could obtain was Mexican laborers. We signed a contract to pay these Mexican workers so much a day, whether they were working or not. We had to take with us cook book giving recipes for Mexican dishes, and try to provide them with food comparable with that which they had in Mexico. Portions of the book were in English and portions in Mexican. I frankly admit that I could not attempt to hold a conversation with these Mexicans. When I brought them to the farm, the cook said, "You brought the Mexicans here; now you tell me what to cook for them."

That is the kind of problem we had. When I took them out into the field to show them how to shock grain, I had to put the bundles in shocks myself, to demonstrate how it should be done. As a result, I put up more shocks than they did. If I could hire an American worker I would let the Mexicans go. Just the same, in the emergency they came in very handy.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator proves the point. This is not a case of utilizing labor that can go right into the field and harvest the crop. Any farmer who utilizes help which comes from off-shore must make a considerable investment. He is at a tremendous expense if he wants to harvest his crop. In many cases he is somewhat sorry, after the harvest is over, when he looks at his bank balance, that he did not let the crop go, because the cost of harvesting his crop, in many instances, is such that he has not accomplished anything but saving the food, without a profit on his operation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think, before the Senator entered the debate, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] gave substantially these figures; that the report of last year showed that somewhat more than 4,000,000 workers were moved by this service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Not 4,000,000 separate persons, but 4,000,000 separate operations, involving quite often the same people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Four million placements; and that the maximum number of off-shore laborers at any time was around 66,000.

The amendment offered requires the payment of a premium only in the case of a farmer or gardener who gets one of the off-shore laborers. The question

which I am addressing to the Senator is there: Does he think it is fair and right, in a program which is directed to helping our farmers market these heavy crops in this disjointed period following the war, for one neighbor getting one class of labor to be required to pay a premium of one or two dollars a day, and probably have labor which is less effective, and another neighbor paying less for better labor? It seems to me it is an unequal handling of the problem and will be sure to bring dissatisfaction and trouble. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has asked me a question and has pretty well answered it himself. At this point in the discussion I am not disposed to take issue with him. I hope that answers his question.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to point out one of the reasons for the continuation of this program. It is made clear in the bill itself. It is in order to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program. That is one reason that I am for the extension until there can be an orderly way worked out to handle the matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM].

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I wish merely to make a brief statement. All of us know that this program has been in existence for several years. The beet growers of the West have come to depend upon it, and at this particular season of the year they are exercised as to whether they will be able to harvest their beets if they plant them. The Senate took considerable time last week to discuss the sugar situation. Today the inference has been made here that the United States has not returned to a peacetime economy. Inasmuch as sugar controls were extended by the bill which was before the Senate last week, I wonder whether we can conscientiously say that the United States has returned to a peacetime economy.

Today we still have sugar rationing in the United States. If we are to get away from sugar rationing next fall, our people had better produce a considerable quantity of sugar this summer. This bill will assist in doing that.

My particular State has tried to maintain full production during the war years, and I think it has done so. If our people can receive assurance, under the extension of the program by this bill for a mere 6 months, the State of Montana can be expected to contribute an additional 270,000,000 pounds of sugar. That will help give the housewives of the United States a little more sugar, and it will also help the sugar-beet industry, and it will also help get rid of some of the rationing.

I am very sympathetic toward what the distinguished Senators from Missouri and South Dakota have advocated this afternoon. It seems to me that this program should be extended for 6

months, under a continuation of the present law. The machinery is already set up, and the people of the country, especially the sugar-beet producers, are looking to the Congress to extend the program for 6 months, so that they can meet the sugar quotas which have been asked of them by the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment to the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment as amended?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, as amended, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment as amended will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4 of the committee amendment, as amended, it is proposed to insert the following after line 14:

The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, 78th Cong., 2d sess., title 1), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment merely seeks to reinsert in the bill section 2 (a) of the House version of the bill, which was stricken out by the Senate committee's substitute. That paragraph merely provides that this act and the preceding appropriation act shall not prohibit the State employment services from operating farm-labor supply services.

My reason for offering the amendment to the committee amendment is a bulletin which I have received from the Minnesota Division of Employment and Security, dated March 26, 1947. In Minnesota, as in most other States, the State employment offices are integrated with the State unemployment compensation division. They pay unemployment compensation to unemployed workers; they also have been given the responsibility, by the Veterans' Employment Service, of paying the servicemen's readjustment allowances of \$20 a week. The reason for this bulletin was the fact that there was a shortage, in various communities, of 149 farm workers. That was on March 26. In those same communities there were 1,576 veterans drawing servicemen's readjustment allowances, whose records showed that they had been quotaed as farm hands, and under the bill of rights they should have been offered those farm jobs which were available.

I do not see how we can hope to administer efficiently and economically an unemployment-compensation set-up and the servicemen's readjustment allow-

ance program, both of which are contingent upon the recipients being offered any jobs that are available, for which they are suited, when the farm-labor placement set-up is completely separate from the State employment service. I suppose there was some justification for it during the war when there was a great movement of people across State lines; but now that the employment services in the various States have moved into smaller communities and are close to the farms, with their offices usually in the same block in the same community, and simply operated by different State agencies, it seems to me that if the States, in anticipation of the end of the present law on January 1, wish to turn over the regular recruitment job to their State employment services, they should be permitted to do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the committee gave full consideration to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota, which was section 2 of the bill as passed by the House. We could see no need for conducting a duplicating service as between the State employment services and the extension services during the 6 months this program is to remain in effect. We believe that section 2 of the Senate version of the bill, being the committee amendment, adequately covers the situation.

So I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota will be rejected. At any rate, on the 1st of next January the farm-placement work will revert to the State employment agencies, where it used to be.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment on page 4, as amended.

The amendment to the committee amendment as amended was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment as amended?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am in favor of the bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Nevertheless I wish to make one or two observations with reference to the proposed legislation.

I am sure that at the termination of the 6 months' period, we shall have another bill of this kind again before the Congress of the United States. I do not underestimate the necessity of having sufficient labor to take care of certain perishable crops which are necessary to our economic life. In the State of Illinois a number of farmers and canning industries during the war period used prisoners of war, as well as foreign labor, to care for these perishable crops during a period of some 2 months of each year. But I think the evidence before our committee will disclose that this type of labor is known as stoop labor, and that the time has almost come in the United States when it is difficult to persuade the average agricultural worker to go into the fields and do the kind of menial labor that must be done to produce this crop.

As a result of the last 5 or 6 years of importations of foreign labor from the Bahamas, Puerto Rico, and Mexico, it will be found more and more troublesome for those who produce sugar beets in the Western States and those who produce other and different perishable crops in this country, to get the average American agricultural worker to go into the fields and do the stoop labor.

I hope that those who are responsible for the production of these perishable crops and who are compelled to employ this kind and type of labor will begin now to adjust themselves to the time when sooner or later this kind of an appropriation must by necessity be denied. In my judgment now is the time for those people to begin to set their house in order, for sooner or later the Government of the United States must cease to appropriate millions of dollars each year to bring to this country these migratory workers. That is especially true if we have heavy unemployment in this country.

I merely mention this in passing because as I said before I am going to support the bill. While this may be in vain, I do hope that at the end of 6 months we will not be faced again with a similar measure for a continuance of the importation of labor of the kind we have been discussing, necessitating an appropriation out of the Federal Treasury of some fifteen or sixteen million dollars.

I appreciate that this is still a part of the war program and in this reconstruction era I am willing to go as far as any one in appropriating the necessary funds to produce sugar and the other perishable crops which are vital to our economy and to our way of life. But I repeat what I said before, those who are engaged in this great industry throughout the United States should begin to find ways and means of finding their own labor in the shortest period of time, because this cannot go on indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 2102) was passed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. ELLENDER conferees on the part of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 78, Senate Resolution 81, authorizing the Committee on

Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "investigation", to strike out "as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed" and to insert "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters."

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Is the Senate in executive session?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in legislative session.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the chairman of the committee before we vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to make inquiry with respect to the budget the Senator has submitted. Through inadvertence, the budget was not printed in the report. I am sure that was unintentional on the part of the Committee on Rules and Administration, because my understanding is that when an investigating committee asks for money from the contingent fund a budget must be submitted and the budget is to be included in the report of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That was done in the case of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and it has been done a number of times. Through inadvertence, the budget was not included in the report on the pending resolution, and therefore the Senate has no knowledge as to that.

I am not blaming anyone. The budget provides for an expenditure of \$35,000.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. A chief counsel at the rate of \$10,000 a year, a chief investigator at \$7,628, three investigators at \$5,695, four assistant investigators at \$5,116. I should like to inquire of the Senator, because I have made some inquiries in the committee, whether this budget was considered by the Committee on Civil Service and approved by it.

Mr. LANGER. No; they simply told us to go ahead and prepare it and submit it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I make a point of order, Mr. President. I call the attention of the Chair to Senate Resolution 77, submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on February 15, 1945, and reported by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], without amendment, considered, and agreed to, on June

28, 1945. It is now a standing rule of the Senate. It reads:

Resolved, That the Senate shall not (1) authorize the payment from the contingent fund of the Senate of the expenses, in excess of \$5,000, of any inquiry or investigation hereafter authorized, or (2) increase the amount heretofore authorized to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate in connection with any inquiry or investigation, unless, prior to adoption of the resolution authorizing such payment or providing for such increase, the committee or subcommittee thereof authorized to conduct such inquiry or investigation shall have submitted to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—

Under the Reorganization Act that jurisdiction is transferred to the Committee on Rules and Administration—a budget, in such form as the committee may require—

There is no question as to the form—setting forth its estimates of expenses proposed to be incurred for personal services, hearings, and travel, and such other information as the committee may require.

So it is provided that the Senate shall not consider a measure appropriating money from the contingent fund of the Senate unless in conformity with the rule prescribed. My contention is that the Senate is prohibited unless the Committee on Civil Service has approved this budget; and the Committee on Civil Service has not approved the budget.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee has.

Mr. HAYDEN. I inquired of every member of the committee I could reach, and none of them said he had even seen the budget.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and myself, and at the time the matter was agreed on it was said we could go ahead and submit whatever the budget was to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which the Senator from Arizona is a member, and we took the matter up.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, and I assumed the necessary action had been taken, but actually the budget was never submitted to the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. None of the members of the committee ever saw it—

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Prior to the time the Senator took it to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LANGER. The subcommittee saw it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I make the point of order that until the committee meets and approves this budget the Senate cannot appropriate any money under the pending resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair's ruling turns, of course, on the question of fact. Is the Chair correct in his understanding that the Senators agree on the facts?

Mr. LANGER. We agree on the facts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the circumstances, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. TAFT. What is this rule of the Senate? Is it a rule of the Senate today?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Was it not superseded by the La Follette-Monroney Act, section 134 (b)?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that the resolution is still in force.

Mr. LANGER. I shall bring the matter before the Committee on Civil Service tomorrow.

Mr. HAYDEN. That was the next point I wanted to make—

Mr. LANGER. So long as the point of order has been raised, I think that is right.

Mr. HAYDEN. I desire to suggest that the budget be reexamined. In my opinion \$35,000 is not needed to get the answer as to why so few Republicans have been appointed postmasters in the past 14 years. It is for the same reason that so few Democrats were appointed postmasters from 1921 to 1933. There were Republican administrations in those years. There have been Democratic administrations from 1933 to this time, and naturally, of course, a majority of the appointments have been Democratic.

I suggest further to the Senator that there are now pending before his committee some 639 postmaster nominations. I am sure that there would be no occasion whatever to investigate the great majority of them. By mere inquiry of the Civil Service Commission it can be ascertained in how many instances there was but one examination, and in what cases the high man was appointed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask, for the record, at what time were postmasters put under civil service?

Mr. HAYDEN. The history of that action very briefly is this: They were first put under civil service by Executive order issued by President Wilson in 1917. Prior to that time, in the McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft administrations, and in the first 4 years of the Wilson administration, they were considered political patronage. I know that, because I was in the House of Representatives and I appointed about 300 of them. I picked out friends of mine in the various towns and appointed them. But Mr. Wilson grew tired of the postmaster controversy. After his reelection he issued an Executive order providing that thereafter all postmasters should be appointed as the result of a civil-service examination, and that the high man should be appointed. During the last 4 years of his administration that is exactly the way it was done. No Representative was consulted. No Senator was consulted. No Democratic national committeeman was consulted.

When Mr. Harding became President he issued an Executive order changing it, retaining the civil-service examination, but providing that, as in all other instances, any one of the three highest per-

sons certified as qualified might be appointed. The effect of that worried the Civil Service Reform League greatly. They pointed out in a report that, under 4 years of the Wilson administration, in the 2,000 post offices they had checked over in the Northern States, 800 Republicans had been appointed, whereas only 600 Democrats had retained office. That was in the section where the Republicans predominated. It really was done on the square, but they greatly feared that this method of allowing the choice of any one of the three highest on the list would result in politics entering into the selection of postmasters. A few years later their fears were realized, according to a subsequent report, which shows that the Post Office Department, when the three names came over from the Civil Service Commission, immediately notified the Republican Representative, or, if there was no Republican Representative from the district, the Senator; if not, the national committeeman; and he made a recommendation as to which of the three should be selected.

That was carried on through the Harding administration; the Executive orders issued by Coolidge carried on the same plan; and Hoover carried it also. When Franklin Roosevelt became President, he issued an order of the same kind, which was in effect until 1936, at which time he reverted to the original Wilson idea and provided that there should be a civil-service examination, the high man to be selected.

That did not suit the House of Representatives, and a bill was immediately introduced to provide the present way of handling it. That bill was passed by the Senate and became a law, I think, sometime in 1938. Since that time postmaster appointments have been handled just the same as any other civil-service appointments; that is, one of the three highest names is selected.

Of course, in the meantime, an Executive order has been issued giving preference to veterans. That preference is now conferred by law, and in the case of the 639 nominations now pending, about 250 of them are veterans. That is why I want the Civil Service Committee to look into this matter very carefully. I am sure if they will go through the 639 names they will find comparatively few that are questioned. I doubt very much whether it will require \$35,000 to ascertain in those few cases what ought to be done. Of course, it is a matter for the committee and for the Senate to decide. That is my judgment about it.

CONTINUANCE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION UNTIL JUNE 30, 1948

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 350.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949, which had been reported from the Committee

on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after "June 30", to strike out "1949" and insert "1948", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948."

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I know of no other legislative business to come before the Senate at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator that the Senate recur to the unfinished business, which was displaced temporarily so that other matters could be considered.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to follow with that suggestion. I know of no further legislative business to be taken up at this time. I was about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 938 was temporarily displaced.

Mr. WHITE. The Chair is quite correct. I move that the Senate resume consideration of Senate bill 938.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium-term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1621. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports;

H. R. 1713. An act to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.



DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 11, 1947
For actions of April 10, 1947
80th-1st, No. 67

CONTENTS

Adjourned.....5	Labor, farm.....1	Prices, farm.....2
Electrification, rural...10	Lands.....7	Relief, foreign.....6
Flood control.....12	Lands, grazing.....14	Roads.....9
Foreign affairs.....17	Livestock and meat.....16	Social security.....15
Housing.....3	Personnel.....11	Soil conservation.....14
Labor.....4	Prices.....13	Transportation.....8

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated Greek-Turkish aid bill. House sent to conference bill to continue farm-labor program for 6 months. Rep. Keating criticized Government spending and inserted a constituent's letter blaming the Secretary and USDA for high grain prices.

HOUSE

1. FARM LABOR. Disagreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 2102, to continue the farm-labor supply program for 6 months and appointed the following conferees: Reps. Hope, Andresen, Johnson (Ill.), Flannagan, and Cooley (p. 3413). Senate conferees were appointed April 8.
2. FARM PRICES. Rep. Andersen, Minn., criticized "the sudden drive on the part of the eastern interests to bring down our raw materials price levels," and claimed that higher farm prices do not mean an increase in the cost of living (p. 3421).
3. HOUSING. Received a Milwaukee, Wis. petition urging passage of S. 866, the national housing bill (p. 3422).
4. LABOR. Majority Leader Halleck announced that the general labor bill was expected to be brought up on Tues., Apr. 15 (p. 3400).
5. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 14 (p. 3421).

SENATE

6. FOREIGN RELIEF. Continued debate on S. 938, to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey (pp. 3378-98).
7. LANDS. The Expenditures in Executive Departments Committee reported without recommendation S. 28, to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the office of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the director and associate director of the Bureau of Land Management (S. Rept. 97) (p. 3377).

8. TRANSPORTATION. Received an Alaska Legislature memorial urging adjustments in transportation regulations and rates on shipments to Alaska (pp. 3376-7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. ROADS. S. 1084, by Sen. Hill, Ala. (for himself and Sen. Sparkman, Ala.), to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide that the U. S. shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," as amended and supplemented. To Public Works Committee. (p. 3377.)
10. RURAL ELECTRIFICATION. S. 1087, by Sen. Stewart, Tenn. (for himself and Sen. Hill, Ala.), to amend the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 so as to authorize REA to refinance, out of its loan funds, obligations owed by certain municipalities to TVA, to the extent that such indebtedness was incurred with respect to electric transmission and distribution lines or system or portions thereof serving persons in rural areas. To Agriculture and Forestry Committee. (p. 3377.)
11. PERSONNEL. H. R. 3015, by Rep. Chelf, Ky., to revoke the naturalization of persons who have been discharged from the U. S. Government service in compliance with Executive Order No. 9835; to deport such persons; and to deport aliens concerning who the Attorney General knows or has reason to believe their presence in the U. S. may endanger the public safety or welfare of the country. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 3422.) Remarks of author (p. 3410).
H. R. 3023, by Rep. Rees, Kans., providing for a Federal Employees' Loyalty Act of 1947. To Post Office and Civil Service Committee. (p. 3422). Remarks of author (pp. 3409-10).
12. FLOOD CONTROL. H. R. 3019, by Rep. Ramey, Ohio, to amend the act of June 22, 1936, so as to permit the construction of public works on the Great Lakes for purposes of flood control. To Public Works Committee. (p. 3422.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Keating, N. Y., criticizing Government spending and including a constituent's letter blaming the Secretary and USDA for high grain prices (pp. A1695-6).
14. SOIL CONSERVATION; GRAZING. Rep. Dawson, Utah, inserted C. N. Woods' statement urging soil conservation practices and action to prevent over-grazing on Utah range lands (pp. A1705-6).
15. SOCIAL SECURITY. Extension of remarks of Rep. McDonough, Calif., favoring extension of social security benefits to include persons not now covered by the Act (p. A1700).
16. VETERINARY MEDICINE. Rep. Gillie, Ind., inserted Gen. R. A. Kelser's article on the contributions of veterinary medicine to the victory in War II (pp. A1706-8).
17. FOREIGN RELIEF. Various remarks and insertions on foreign policy and relief (pp. A1689-90, A1697-8, A1709).

COMMITTEE-HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS for Apr. 11: S. Appropriations, deficiency appropriation bill, Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill; H. Appropriations, USDA appropriation bill (ex.); S. Civil Service, civil service retirement bill (ex.); H. Agriculture, regulation of marketing of rodenticides, wood killers, pest-control devices, etc. (Harry Reed to testify); S. Expenditures, merger of quarantine services (Fladness, Rohwer, and Moseloy to testify).

Mr. MERROW. I cannot.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does anyone know? Does the State Department know whether it was a secret agreement entered into at Yalta or Potsdam, or where it was entered into?

Mr. MERROW. I presume the State Department knows.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It has not been made public, as I understand.

Mr. MERROW. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would it be possible for the committee to question the State Department and perhaps get some information as to when the agreement was reached on Korea?

Mr. MERROW. I think it would be possible, and I would be very glad to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be interesting to know.

Mr. MERROW. According to William Henry Chamberlin in an article which appeared in the American Mercury, May 1946, the lands annexed since September 1939 are:

	Area in square miles	Population
Eastern Poland.....	68,290	10,150,000
Finnish Karelia.....	16,173	470,000
Lithuania.....	24,058	3,029,000
Latvia.....	20,056	1,950,000
Estonia.....	18,353	1,120,000
Bessarabia and Bukovina.....	19,360	3,748,000
Moldavia.....	13,124	2,200,000
Petsamo.....	4,087	4,000
Koenigsberg area of East Prussia.....	3,500	400,000
Carpatho-Ukraine.....	4,922	800,000
South Sakhalin.....	14,075	415,000
Kurile Islands.....	3,949	4,500
Tannu Tuva.....	64,000	64,000
Total.....	273,947	24,354,500

The territories over which Moscow has extended domination by puppet governments and Communist influence include:

	Millions of inhabitants
Poland.....	20 to 25
Czechoslovakia.....	12 to 15
Hungary.....	9 to 10
Austria.....	3.5
Yugoslavia.....	14 to 16
Bulgaria.....	6 to 7
Rumania.....	13
Eastern Germany.....	25
Finland.....	4
Manchuria.....	40
North Korea.....	10
Outer Mongolia.....	1

The second principle underlying Russian foreign policy is to spread communism whenever and wherever possible. In 1945 I was with a congressional committee in Ankara and Istanbul. The Turks expressed great fear that their powerful neighbor to the north would move on them in an effort to take the Dardanelles. Constantine Brown, in a dispatch from Istanbul which appeared in the Sunday Star, published in Washington on April 6, stated:

Yet Turkey's financial position is shaky because the bulk of the national income has to be spent on military preparations. The Turkish Prime Minister told this correspondent that if it had not been for this precaution, the Russians would have entered Turkey last summer.

In Tehran many members of the Parliament informed us that the Soviet Union would ultimately try to annex that

country in order to reach the oil of the Persian Gulf. In the Balkan States it is evident that free elections would turn out the Communist parties now in power. The people cannot rid themselves of rulers who dominate them by force. From east to west and north to south there are active Communist parties. One has only to visit the countries in Europe, the Balkans, and the Middle East or to observe the activities of the Communist Party in the United States to be convinced that the spreading of communism to every country is a cardinal principle of the Moscow foreign policy.

In my opinion Mr. Stalin and his associates will not stop their program of aggressive expansion and of spreading communism until the United States takes a firm stand. I believe this is the time for a show-down. This is the time to make the position of the United States absolutely clear.

Mr. Chamberlin in his article to which I have previously referred concludes in the following words:

Russia's human and material losses in the war have been too great. Stalin is too well aware that Soviet technique in aviation and industrial production is inferior to America's. So far as we know he does not possess the atom bomb. Russian naval power is negligible. Besides, the Soviet Union needs time to digest the immense areas it has already swallowed. We must assume, therefore, that the current Soviet dynamism will stop short of a line where, in Stalin's judgment, America and Great Britain will fight rather than yield.

FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

On November 29, 1945, 16 months ago, I introduced a resolution providing for a select committee of 23 members of the House to make a study of the foreign policy of the United States and to investigate the Department of State. I regret that the Seventy-ninth Congress did not act upon this resolution. Such a study would have been most helpful in developing a firm, realistic, and intelligent foreign policy to meet the exigencies of the present hour. Over a year ago, on January 22, 1946, I said on the floor of the House:

If I have gained anything in traveling in over 30 countries, if I have gained anything from being in London as a delegate to the Educational Conference, it is this: We must move immediately to see if we can develop a firm, realistic, objective foreign policy for the United States.

On January 3, 1947, I reintroduced my resolution, which was referred to the Rules Committee. Recent events have emphasized the importance of the study I propose. I am including my bill in the RECORD. It is as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, 1 of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the committee to conduct—

(1) a comprehensive study of all phases, both economic and political, of the foreign policy of the United States, including a complete review of our interests in all parts of

the world; such study to be made with respect to each foreign country and each geographical region, such as the Balkan states, the Middle East, Central and South America, and so forth; and

(2) an investigation of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States.

(b) Such study and investigation shall be made for the purpose of enabling the committee to make such recommendations as it deems advisable with respect to—

(1) the formulation and execution of a realistic over-all foreign policy for the United States which will serve the best interests of the United States;

(2) improvements in the operation and administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service of the United States;

(3) methods for securing accurate and up-to-date information concerning world conditions; and

(4) the communication of such information to the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. Such recommendations shall be embodied in reports to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), which shall be made by the committee during the present Congress at intervals of not more than 90 days; the first report to be made within 90 days after the date of the passage of this resolution and the final report to be made on January 2, 1949.

SEC. 4. For purposes of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

There is now greater urgency for the adoption of my resolution than ever before. I shall continue to press for a complete and thorough study of the foreign policy of the United States, both economic and political. As the matter stands there are five committees of the House making attempts at studies and investigations of certain phases of the activities of the Department of State. They include Foreign Affairs, Appropriations, Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Post Office and Civil Service, and Un-American Activities. One committee, and it ought to be a special committee, should be given full and complete power to study and report on the foreign policy of this country and to investigate the Department of State and the Foreign Service. We need only to review the events of the past few months and to point to the critical current world conditions to be convinced of the necessity of acting on the proposition I have set forth.

Such a committee as I have requested ought to be authorized at once to make a thorough investigation of our foreign policy both economic and political. By such procedure we would be able to determine with intelligence our course of action for the future. We need to secure an over-all world picture. Our interests are global and unless we have a wise foreign policy based on a most careful study of our interests around the world, we

Apr. 15



DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 16, 1947
For actions of April 15, 1947
80th-1st, No. 70

CONTENTS

Committees.....	7	Lands.....	11	Subsidies.....	12
Economy.....	18	Lands, grazing.....	9	Taxation.....	17
Expenditures.....	19	Loans, farm.....	16	Trade, foreign.....	5,15
Flood control.....	6	Oleomargarine.....	17	Transportation.....	13
Foreign affairs.....	8,20	Regional authority.....	4	Veterans' benefits.....	16
Labor.....	3	Reports.....	10	Wildlife.....	9,14
Labor, farm.....	1	Small business.....	10	Wool.....	2

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on bill to continue farm-labor program. House committee reported amended bill to provide for wool price supports. Rep. O'Konski commended FHA farm loans to veterans.

HOUSE

1. **FARM LABOR.** Received the conference report on H. R. 2102, to continue the farm-labor supply program (pp. 3565-6). As reported by the conferees, the bill provides for ending the program on Dec. 31, 1947, with a 30-day grace period for foreign laborers to return to their country, and stipulates that the program shall not be construed to interfere with the functions of the USES or State employment services with respect to maintaining a Farm Placement Service; also includes the Knowland amendment providing that Mexican labor may stay in the U. S. as long as employed as such, but in no event after Dec. 31, 1947.
2. **WOOL PROGRAM.** The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments S. 814, to provide for price support of wool (H. Rept. 257)(p. 3568). The committee added an amendment imposing a tax of up to 50% on imported wool, voted to maintain support prices at the 1946 level (the Senate version would have permitted CCC to exceed 1946 prices), and included an authorization for CCC to sell Government wool below parity; and rejected a proposal that wool be made a basic commodity.
3. **LABOR.** Began debate on H. R. 3020, the labor-management relations bill, after agreeing to consider it by a 319-46 vote (pp. 3520-65).
4. **REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT.** Rep. Lane, Mass., spoke in favor of creation of a Merrimack Valley Authority (pp. 3566-8).
5. **FOREIGN TRADE.** Received the President's message recommending legislation to authorize supervision of the exportation of arms, ammunition, implements of war, and related commodities, and the importation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to provide for registration of manufacturers, etc., of munitions; and to provide for more information on arms traffic (H. Doc. 195); to Foreign Affairs Committee (pp. 3531-2).

6. FLOOD CONTROL. Received from the War Department flood-control survey reports on the Wabash River and Mill Creek Valley (H. Docs. 197, 198); to Public Lands Committee (p. 3568).
7. COMMITTEES. Various subcommittees have been set up under the House Agriculture Committee. They are as follows:

Subcommittee No. 1. Andresen (chm.), Gillie, Simpson, Dague, Flannagan, Grant, and McMillan.

Subcommittee No. 2. Johnson (chm.), Hall, Gross, Goff, Cooley, Poage, and Worley.

Subcommittee No. 3. Murray (chm.), Hill, Fuller, Cotton, Zimmerman, Granger, Abernethy, and Fernos-Isern.

Subcommittee No. 4. Clevenger (chm.), Hoeven, Bramblett, Pace, Gathings, Farrington, and Bartlett.

Food and Agricultural Production Subcommittee. Andresen (chm.), Clevenger, Hill, Hoeven, Farrington, Pace, Poage, and Gathings.

Fertilizer Subcommittee. Johnson (chm.), Murray, Hoeven, Gross, Cooley, Grant, and Abernethy.

Foot and Mouth Disease Subcommittee. Gillie (chm.), Simpson, Bramblett, Granger, and Worley.

Cotton Subcommittee. Johnson (chm.), Clevenger, Hill, Bramblett, Goff, Cooley, Zimmerman, Pace, and Poage.

Fur Subcommittee. Murray (chm.), Hall, Dague, Cotton, Granger, McMillan, Abernethy, and Bartlett.

Crop Insurance Subcommittee. Hill (chm.), Hoeven, Simpson, Goff, Cooley, Pace, and Poage.

(The numbered subcommittees have no general assignments.)

SENATE

8. FOREIGN RELIEF. Continued debate on S. 938, to provide assistance for Greece and Turkey (pp. 3492-517).
Sen. Martin, Pa., inserted speeches delivered by Sens. O'Connor (Md.) and Knowland (Calif.) on America's foreign policy (pp. 3488-92).
9. WILDLIFE; GRAZING. Received a Calif. Legislature resolution urging that action be taken to furnish a permanent supply of water to the grasslands in the western San Joaquin Valley to provide adequate grass for grazing and resting place for wild fowl (p. 3486).
10. REPORTS. Received the annual report of the Library of Congress for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946 and the report of RFC's small business activities for Dec. 1946 (p. 3486).

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. LANDS. S. 1112, by Sen. Watkins, Utah (for himself and Sen. Thomas, Utah), and H.R. 3057, by Rep. Dawson, Utah, providing for the transfer of a part of Fort Douglas, Utah, to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and conveyance of part to the State of Utah, and public agencies of the State of Utah. To Armed Services Committees. (pp. 3487, 3569.)
12. SUBSIDIES. S. 1101, by Sen. Downey, Calif., "to amend Public Law 88, Seventy-ninth Congress," relative to certain RFC subsidies. To Banking and Currency Committee. (p. 3487.)
13. TRANSPORTATION. S. 1111, by Sen. Baldwin, Conn., to amend the act entitled

and denied the right to a decent standard of living while the profits of great corporations multiply as they have in the last year and while the prices of things the workers make go higher and higher and the purchasing power of the individual worker goes lower and lower. We cannot depend upon the benevolence of the great corporations. That has been shown time and time again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] may address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next after the regular business of the day and the previous orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI (at the request of Mr. HARTLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a chart.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks be made today on the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. RAMEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter sent by Walter W. Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers' Union.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post of last Saturday.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the foreign labor supply bill (H. R. 2102) may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: 'or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier' and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: 'or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier'. Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

"Sec. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

"(a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment com-

pensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm-labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: *Provided*, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ELMER THOMAS.

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same. Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The House bill authorized the continuation of the farm labor supply program for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947, and provided that such program should be liquidated by December 31, 1947. The Senate amendment directed the continuation of the program up to and including December 31, 1947, and provided for its liquidation within 30 days thereafter. The conference agreement accepts the Senate provision but makes the continuation of the labor supply program permissive rather than mandatory.

The bill as it passed the House amended section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 so as to permit the use, in connection with the farm labor supply program, of labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and other facilities set up under such act, until December 31, 1947. The conference agreement extends the period during which such facilities may be used in connection with the farm labor supply program to January 31, 1948, so as to make such facilities available for use during the liquidation period.

The Senate amendment added a new section 3, which provides that any Mexican farm laborer presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permit-

ted to remain in this country as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect and he continues in agricultural employment if the employer or employers of such laborers gives satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico and posts an appropriate bond with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service for the return of the Mexican farm laborer without cost to the Government when such farm employment is terminated and in any event not later than December 31, 1947. The conference agreement accepts the Senate amendment in this respect.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. POULSON, for 4 days, on account of the death of a close friend and associate, Lee Galloway, of Los Angeles.

To Mr. STANLEY (at the request of Mr. ALMOND), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. WORLEY (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. JUDD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 day, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, they built a dam to back up the waters and then dug two canals to control the flow for the uses of industry, and in this manner a town was born and its name was Lawrence.

Looking backward, we realize how important was this river—called the Merrimack, after the Indian word meaning "swift waters"—in the birth and development of our city.

Most communities come into being by accident. A man finds a clearing in the wilderness and builds a cabin. He is joined by other families, and a settlement begins. Some enterprising person starts a store to service these people. Goods are brought in to stock the store. The products of the labor of the few families are exchanged for the goods. Each helps the other and so the community grows as its products and needs and services expand. That, in brief form, is the story of most places where people live together in sizable groups.

Lawrence, however, was an exception to this rule. It is the only "made-to-order" city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

In the early days, before the palefaces came, this general area was a sylvan paradise. Bodwell's Falls, now the Lawrence dam, and the shores of the Spicket were favorite resorts for the Indians, especially in the fishing season. Some old writers claim that this was the ancient seat of the Agawam Tribe and it was here that the Princess of the House of Pennacook came to reside.

But, as solitary and adventurous white men began to push the frontier up the Merrimack, the Indians withdrew to New Hampshire. A little more than a 100 years ago, if you stood on the top of Tower Hill, you would see rolling meadows and patches of forest in the valley of the river. And, if you strained your eyes, you might count the presence of 20 families by the plumes of smoke coming from the chimneys of the few scattered homesteads.

In 1793, there were settlements at Methuen and Andover, and there was a rough bridge across the river in this "in-between" country, to provide communications from one to the other. In 1801, a part of the bridge fell in ruins while a drove of cattle were passing over it, and 66 animals perished in the water below. It was repaired, in primitive fashion, and stood until 1807, when a great freshet and run of ice swept most of it away.

There was no Lawrence. There was merely the problem of a bridge, so that the few people in Andover and Methuen might reach one another.

But in 1825, a notable event took place. General Lafayette, of Revolutionary fame, was making a triumphal journey from Boston to Concord, N. H., and he had to cross the bridge. And the good farmers, from miles around, crossed the rolling hills and meadows and came down to the river. General Lafayette traveled in an open carriage and was escorted by several companies of infantry and cavalry and the people gave him a great cheer as he crossed the bridge. On that day scarcely a one gave much thought to the river.

The years passed, and the only sound one heard, apart from the ring of a woodsman's ax, or the lowing of the herd, was the music of the rapids at Bodwell's Falls.

Up to 1845 little change had taken place in more than a century. There was the solitary farmer, the river raftsman, and the fisherman who, with one drag of his net, pulled in a week's supply of food. That was all, except for the restless river flowing to the sea.

There was one man, however, blessed with the vision from which all great enterprise began. As he walked along the banks of the Merrimack he saw and was fascinated by, the unused power of the river. He was a man who never mislaid, or wasted, or destroyed anything that could become of any future use or value. Here, before his eyes, was the greatest physical power within the then-known reach of man, and its possibilities challenged his competitive spirit.

Somewhere, somehow, this potential power could be controlled to turn the wheels of industry in the service of man. And as he studied and thought over this problem, he came to the conclusion that there must be a more considerable fall between Lowell and tidewater in the Merrimack River, than was generally believed.

With a single assistant, and with no other instruments than a straight edge and a spirit level, he measured the fall of the various rapids and got a clearer picture of the mighty source of power and wealth, hidden within these few and unobtrusive rapids.

About 2 miles above the present location, at the head of Peters Falls, a dam could have been constructed at a smaller expenditure of money than where the present dam now stands. This would sacrifice a few feet of fall. So, at that time, a choice of location was by no means certain in this man's mind. On one thing, though, he was determined. He would find in one of the two localities, a great manufacturing center.

Without taking anyone into his confidence, he began to purchase, strip by strip, parcels of land on both sides of the river, until he held in his own right, the whole of Peters Falls.

Having gone as far as he could venture alone in so great an undertaking, he now opened up the whole matter to his nephew, J. G. Abbott, John Nesmith and Samuel Lawrence, all residents of Lowell, explaining what he had done and what he proposed to do.

Impressed by his sound business record and the glowing terms in which he described the possibilities of the project these men, together with Daniel Saunders, Jr., Thomas Hopkinson and Jonathan Tyler of Lowell, and Nathaniel Stevens of Andover, formed the Merrimack Water Power Association.

Some members of the Association, urged the purchase, as quietly as possible, of all lands in the immediate vicinity and as cheaply as possible.

The father of the enterprise, opposed this procedure. He advised, instead, that the Association should announce its intentions of building, in one of the two locations to be decided upon, a new manufacturing city. Furthermore, he believed that the landowners should be offered a joint benefit, by taking bonds from the owners for the conveyance of their lands within a given time and at prices much higher than the value of these lands.

He was given authority to proceed along this line. Patiently he set about the task of contacting present and absent owners. The wise ones laughed and called the whole thing foolish, but who were they to refuse the fancy prices offered for mere farmland? In spite of those discouraging remarks, and the slow tedious job of convincing timid owners who had never made a conveyance of land in their lifetime that there was nothing to fear, this man stuck to his task.

The name of this man was Daniel Saunders, and he was a sturdy example of Yankee enterprise.

As the project developed, it was proposed to call the new town "Saunders" in tribute to the man whose vision and zeal, brought it to life. To this, Mr. Saunders objected, stating that, as there was no town in Massachusetts called Merrimack, and as the new community was located on the river of that name, the settlement should be called "Merrimack" in honor of the river which inspired its development. And so it was, up to the time of its incorporation.

When the act of incorporation was asked of the General Court of Massachusetts, it was decided to call the town Lawrence after the Lawrence family, members of which were leaders among

FARM LABOR SUPPLY PROGRAM

APRIL 15, 1947.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. HOPE, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 2102]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: *That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier". Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.*

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

(a) *The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this Act, shall not be*

construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Service-men's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: Provided, That the employer or employers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947.

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill. The committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment, and that the Senate agree to the same. Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House bill.

The House bill authorized the continuation of the farm labor supply program for a period not to exceed 6 months after June 30, 1947, and provided that such program should be liquidated by December 31, 1947. The Senate amendment directed the continuation of the program up to and including December 31, 1947, and provided for its liquidation within 30 days thereafter. The conference agreement accepts the Senate provision but makes the continuation of the labor supply program permissive rather than mandatory.

The bill as it passed the House amended section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 so as to permit the use, in connection with the farm labor supply program, of labor supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and other facilities set up under such act, until December 31, 1947. The conference agreement extends the period during which such facilities may be used in connection with the farm labor supply program to January 31, 1948, so as to make such facilities available for use during the liquidation period.

The Senate amendment added a new section 3, which provides that any Mexican farm laborer presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect and he continues in agricultural employment if the employer or employers of such laborers gives satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico and posts an appropriate bond with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service for the return of the Mexican farm laborer without cost to the Government when such farm employment is terminated and in any event not later than December 31, 1947. The conference agreement accepts the Senate amendment in this respect.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

p. 22

DIGEST OF
CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
Division of Legislative Reports
(For Department staff only)

Issued April 23, 1947
For actions of April 22, 1947
80th-1st, No. 75

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	4	Housing.....	8	Public works.....	17
Daylight-saving time.....	5	Labor, farm.....	1	Research.....	23
Decentralization.....	7	Lands.....	14	Sugar.....	3
Education.....	11	Lands, reclamation.....	16, 21	Taxation.....	6, 26
Electrification.....	21	Marketing.....	12, 20	Trade, foreign.....	3, 22, 25
Extension work.....	10	Minerals.....	6	Transportation.....	26
Fertilizer.....	19	Monopolies.....	24	Veterans' benefits.....	8
Food inspection.....	12, 20	Personnel.....	15	War powers.....	13
Foreign affairs.....	2, 27	Prices.....	18	Wildlife.....	9

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on farm-labor supply bill. Senate committee reported international sugar agreement. Senate passed Greek-Turkish aid bill. First deficiency bill to be debated by Senate today.

SENATE

1. FARM LABOR. Both houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 2102, to continue the farm-labor supply program for 6 months and provide for its final liquidation (pp. 3914, 3937). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. FOREIGN RELIEF. Passed, 67-23, with amendments S. 938, the Greek-Turkish aid bill (pp. 3873-909).
3. SUGAR AGREEMENT. The Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably Executive E, the international agreement regarding regulation of the production and marketing of sugar, signed in London May 6, 1947 (Ex. Rept. 2)(p. 3913).
4. APPROPRIATIONS. It is expected that H. R. 2849, the first deficiency appropriation bill, will be debated today (p. 3913).

HOUSE

5. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME. The District of Columbia Committee reported without amendment S. 736, to authorize daylight-saving time in D.C. during 1947 (H.Rept. 287; (p. 3942).
6. COPPER TAXES. Agreed to Senate amendments to H.R. 2404, to suspend certain import taxes on copper.(p. 3927). This bill will now be sent to the President.
7. DECENTRALIZATION. Rep. Stevenson, Wis., spoke in favor of decentralizing the Government departments and agencies from Washington (p. 3919).

BILLS INTRODUCED

8. VETERANS' HOUSING. S. 1154, by Sen. Capehart, Ind., "to amend the Veterans Emergency Housing Act. To Banking and Currency Committee. Remarks of author.(p.3910).

9. WILDLIFE. S. 1155, by Sen. Wherry, Nebr., authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife purposes. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 3910.)
10. EXTENSION WORK. H.R. 3136, by Del. Fernos-Isern, P.R., to extend the benefits of the Camper-Ketcham Act to Puerto Rico. To Agriculture Committee. (p. 3943.)
11. EDUCATION. H.R. 3145, by Rep. Stevenson, Wis., to provide for the education of children on Federal reservations and other federally owned property not subject to State or local taxation. To Education and Labor Committee. (p. 3943.)
12. FOOD AND DRUGS. H.R. 3147, by Rep. Wolverton, N.J., to amend Sec. 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide for seizure of foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics which have become adulterated or misbranded while held for sale after shipment in interstate commerce. To Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. (p. 3943.)
13. WAR POWERS. H.R. 3152, by Rep. Wolverton, N.J., to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act. To Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. (p. 3943.)
14. SUBMARGINAL LANDS. H.R. 3153, by Rep. D'Ewart, Mont., to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in Mont. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 3943.)
15. PERSONNEL. H.J.Res. 174, by Rep. Meade, Md., declaring May 1 as National Loyalty Day, a legal holiday. To Judiciary Committee. (p. 3943.)
H.R. 3144, by Rep. Short, Mo., to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve. To Armed Services Committee. (p. 3943.)
16. RECLAMATION. H.R. 3143, by Rep. Rockwell, Colo., to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colo. To Public Lands Committee. (p. 3943.)
17. PUBLIC WORKS. H.J.Res. 176, by Rep. Miller, Nebr., to provide that Federal public-works projects and programs shall be carried out to the full extent authorized by law. To Public Works Committee. (p. 3943.)

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

18. PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Murray, Wis., discussing a Washington Daily News article which states that removal of Government price supports would cause a decline in prices and cites examples (p. A1912).
Rep. Rich, Pa., inserted the Olympic Luggage Corporation's letter announcing a reduction in prices of 10% (pp. A1921-2).
Rep. Potts, N.Y., inserted a N.Y. Sun editorial on the cause of high prices (pp. A1936-7).
19. FERTILIZER. Extension of remarks of Rep. Murray, Wis., criticizing the destruction of German fertilizer plants in the face of the fertilizer shortage and including a Washington Post article by John W. Ball on the subject (p. A1933).
20. FOOD AND DRUGS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Miller, Conn., in favor of his bill (H.R. 3128) to amend the Food and Drug Act by providing for seizure of adulterated foods, drugs, devices, and cosmetics while being held for sale (p. A1956).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably Executive E, Eightieth Congress, first session, the protocol prolonging until August 31, 1947, the international agreement regarding the regulation of the production and marketing of sugar signed in London on May 6, 1937, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, as in executive session the report will be received, and the protocol will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

MORAL ASPECTS OF USE OF THE ATOMIC BOMB—ARTICLE BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article discussing the moral aspects of the use of the atomic bomb, written by him and published in the magazine Air Affairs of the issue of March 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL FOR A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "An Appeal to Citizens of the United States of America for Support of a United States of Europe," together with the names of the signers of the appeal, which appears in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—RADIO ADDRESSES BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several radio addresses delivered by him during the past 2 weeks on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, which appear in the Appendix.]

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—LETTER FROM CAPT. NISHAN DER HAGOPIAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated April 16, 1917, from Capt. Nishan der Hagopian on the subject of aid to Greece and Turkey, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR RELATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1126, Calendar No. 104.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the bill, I submit various supplementary views, and the individual views of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], which I ask to have printed as part of the report heretofore submitted.

There being no objection, the views referred to were ordered to be printed as part of the report (No. 105).

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted the views of the minority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to accom-

pany the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and prevent monopolistic labor practices, and for other purposes; which were ordered to be printed as part 2 of report (No. 105), heretofore reported.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say that we do not intend to proceed with the bill this evening. We intended simply to make it the unfinished business at the present time. I may say further that I have agreed to three possible interruptions. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, desires that the labor bill be set aside at 3 o'clock on Thursday afternoon in order that the Senate may consider the deficiency appropriation bill. I have agreed to that procedure.

I have further agreed that the bill be set aside in behalf of the further consideration sometime tomorrow of order No. 52, Senate Joint Resolution 45, introduced by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], which was given consideration by the Senate yesterday.

Personally I shall have no objection, though it has not been agreed to, to the Senate going into executive session sometime tomorrow or Thursday in connection with the nomination of Mr. Clapp to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I wanted to make inquiry about from the able Senator from Ohio, because it was my understanding from colloquies we have had from time to time during the debate upon the measure which was just passed, that the moment we finished the Greco-Turkish loan bill we would then take up, in executive session, the nomination of Mr. Clapp.

Mr. TAFT. I understand it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works that we do so, but I wish also to be certain that it is agreeable to the opponents as well as the advocates of Mr. Clapp. However, when that nomination is reached, I hope tomorrow or the next day, I shall make no objection to the Senate going into executive session to consider the nomination of Mr. Clapp.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works from which the nomination of Mr. Clapp was reported, I will say that I have conferred with the Senator from Ohio, and it is entirely satisfactory to me that the nomination be taken up tomorrow. I have also conferred with other Senators, some of whom are supporting the nomination and some of whom are opposed to it, and so far as I am aware at this time it is entirely agreeable that the nomination be taken up tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of

the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1126.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I did not hear all of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. TAFT. To restate the situation, it is understood that the labor bill will be deferred in behalf of three other matters: First, Senate Joint Resolution 45, the author of which is the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]; second, the Clapp nomination; and, third, the urgent deficiency bill, but for no other matters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did I correctly understand the chairman of the Committee on Public Works to say that there was an agreement to vote on the Clapp nomination at tomorrow's executive session?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There was no agreement as to the time for voting. It was agreed that tomorrow, in executive session, we would proceed to the consideration of the Clapp nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1126) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments in the nature of corrections of typographical errors in Senate bill 1126, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and myself, I send to the desk several amendments intended to be proposed to Senate bill 1126, and ask that the amendments be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments be printed and lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2404) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

China. I have some reports that a very small percentage of the relief that is going to China actually accomplishes the purpose for which it is sent. I am not talking about the Communist area of China, but the other areas, where there is civil war, where there is a ruler in one county and another ruler in the next county. One report is that about one dollar out of every sixty actually goes to the place it is intended for. Is that true?

Mr. HERTER. I think the gentleman is probably correct. I am not personally familiar with the situation in China, but I know that at one time the misuse of relief funds was so great in China that UNRRA stopped sending any further relief supplies. From the viewpoint of continuing the relief operation in China, I can give the exact figures. The UNRRA program for China totaled \$529,650,000. That program is still in operation. Shipments will continue through until July under that particular operation. That is getting right into the harvest season. For that reason, I do not feel that China, even though it may be named in the bill, is really an appropriate recipient of the type of relief I think this country ought to be giving at the moment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman propose to go so far as to set up a world-wide WPA to feed all the nations of the world?

Mr. HERTER. I should like to answer that in a moment when I come to the amendments that I think ought to be adopted. I think we ought to name the specific countries in which we think relief ought to be carried on, and then allow some leeway for emergencies. I believe some member of the committee will offer such an amendment.

When you go from China, which has just been covered, to Poland we have no adequate figures of any kind whatsoever. I am told there is in the city of Washington today an individual who has made a very careful calculation as to Poland's needs between now and the next harvest. I have not heard what those are, but no competent American officials have surveyed the Polish scene to make an accurate estimate of what is required in that country. However, I am perfectly willing, if there is actual starvation and it can be handled without strengthening the Communist Party, to vote money for Poland, but I should like to be convinced of that fact.

To go to Austria: Austria without any question is in very bad shape. It is a country which is economically a monstrosity. It has been from the time Austria was severed from the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It is going to require economic aid unless it can in turn become a part of a larger customs union, but at the moment it is in very difficult shape. However, Austria was envisaged in the program at a time when the State Department thought we would have a peace treaty with Austria, when it would be considered a member of the family of nations. It is still an ex-enemy coun-

try under military domination. Approximately one-third of that country is under Russian troops. To figure the exact needs of Austria is again a very difficult thing. I am convinced that Austria needs food and needs it badly, and needs relief supplies badly.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is not Austria occupied by the military forces of Russia, and are they not living off the resources of Austria?

Mr. HERTER. No; only approximately one-third of Austria is occupied by the Russians. There is an American military zone, a British military zone, and a French military zone.

The city of Vienna itself is divided into seven different military zones—two Russian, two British, two French, one German, and one middle zone that they call Innerstadt, which is controlled by all four countries.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman would not leave the impression that food from Austria is not being siphoned off into other countries at this time, would he?

Mr. HERTER. I do not know what the situation is in Russian-occupied Austria. Austria never could feed itself. Austria has to import foodstuffs to carry on. Of all the countries in Europe today, Austria probably needs food the most. I think probably the chairman of the committee would agree with me on that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. When General Patton was here in the fall of 1945, he came by to see me, and in the course of our conversation he asked me why we wanted to feed Germany. He said "they have the best crops in Germany I ever saw." He said, "We did not shoot up the fields; we shot up the towns."

I asked another general last year what changes had come about. He said for one thing the Communists drove off the Germans' livestock and took away their machinery with which they had to make a living. They have had time to make two crops since the war closed in Europe. Are we going to be called upon, are the people of this country who now have the greatest national debt the world ever knew, going to be called upon from year to year to feed the people of Europe because the Communist regimes spread over Europe will not let those people make their own living?

It seems to me we are asked to aid countries that have had ample time and ample opportunity to produce at least two crops since the war closed. If we keep this up, I am not sure that some of them will be calling on us for years and years to come.

Mr. HERTER. If I may continue, I have not the time to go into countries occupied by the military forces of the United States. Those are countries that

are today under the American flag, wholly in Japan, wholly in Okinawa, and certainly wholly in Germany, within the American-occupied area of Germany. I certainly would not like to see people starving under the American flag.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Since the report of former President Hoover to President Truman, we have had the significant activity of General Marshall in Moscow where he has finally taken the position that the United States is not going to permit a system of reparations or a level of industry in Germany which will mean that reparations go out at one end while we pour relief in at the other end indefinitely. So, we have taken a firm stand finally on the proposition that the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with the gentleman that it is an awful thing to think of people starving to death. But we have seen them starving to death in India, even in the streets of Calcutta, for years and years and years. What I am kicking about is that we have permitted the spread of communism over Europe, the most infamous influence the world has seen in 2,000 years, and it has prevented those people from making their own living. What I am afraid of is that if we continue to feed communism on the one hand, although we are ostensibly fighting it on the other, this condition never will cease, and we will be called upon for years and years to feed the hungry people of Europe.

Mr. HERTER. I would like to run through a part of this picture that deals with finances and then perhaps get down to further details. In Hungary there is no question but what food was taken out at one end. They had a very bad crop season last year. They are undoubtedly suffering. I am convinced the people of Hungary are not Communists. The one election that was held shows that extremely clearly. They are not Communists. They are today in peril under the domination of a stronger power adjacent to them. I think if we can assure help to these people it would strengthen our hand in the very direction that the gentleman from Mississippi is worrying about rather than weaken it.

On the other hand, I am very disturbed by the fact that no American officials have made an inspection on the spot or have any detailed information as to the requirements.

On the subject of Greece we will be hearing a great deal more about Greece in connection with the Greco-Turkish aid matter before long.

We have been told that Greece had to have food prior to the harvest. Estimates have been made that roughly \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 of this fund will be applicable to Greece. For how long a period that applies I do not know, but I have before me a letter from the Controller of UNRRA, of which I want to

Apr. 28





[PUBLIC LAW 40—80TH CONGRESS]

[CHAPTER 43—1ST SESSION]

[H. R. 2102]

AN ACT

To provide for a six months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the farm labor supply program conducted pursuant to the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, including the exemptions relating to the admission of farm laborers authorized by section 5 (g) of such Act, may be continued up to and including December 31, 1947, and thereafter shall be liquidated within thirty days. In order to continue to make available for the purposes of this program all labor-supply centers, labor homes, labor camps, and facilities heretofore available in this program, section 2 (d) of the Farmers' Home Administration Act of 1946 (Public Law 731, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session) is hereby amended by deleting therefrom the following language: "or until six months after the termination of the present hostilities as determined by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by the President, whichever is the earlier" and inserting in lieu thereof the following language: "or January 30, 1948, whichever is the earlier". Such amounts as may be necessary for the continuance and liquidation of such program as provided in this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this Act—

(a) The provisions of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, title I), as amended and supplemented, and as extended by this Act, shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any of the functions of the United States Employment Service or State public employment services with respect to maintaining a farm placement service as authorized under the Act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113).

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Labor shall take such action as may be necessary to assure maximum cooperation between the agricultural extension services of the land-grant colleges and the State public employment agencies in the recruitment and placement of domestic farm labor and in the keeping of such records and information with respect thereto as may be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the State unemployment compensation laws and of title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended (58 Stat. 295).

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any Mexican farm laborer who is presently in this country and engaged in agricultural employment may be permitted to remain in this country, as long as the farm labor supply program is in effect, and he continues in agricultural employment: *Provided*, That the employer or employ-

ers of such laborers give satisfactory assurance to the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service that the terms and conditions of employment are satisfactory to the Government of Mexico, and that assurance, including an appropriate bond, is given to the satisfaction of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service to the effect that any such Mexican farm laborer will be returned to his place of recruitment or to such other place as the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service may require, without cost to the Government, when such farm employment terminates and, in any event, not later than December 31, 1947.

Approved April 28, 1947.